Duke University Libraries
D02269140O

Copyright by
John Jay Brogan
1997

THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS

IN THE WRITINGS OF ATHANASIUS

by

John Jay Brogan

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: March 28, 1997

Approved:

D. Moody Smith, Co-Supervisor

Bart D. Ehrman, Co-Supervisor

Dale B Martin

Elizabeth Clark

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Religion
in the Graduate School
of Duke University

1997

Date: April 25, 1991

Approved:

D. Moody Smith, Co-Supervisor

Mary C. Boys, Co-Supervisor

Ellis M. Rivkin

Elisabeth Clark

ABSTRACT

(Religion - Biblical Studies)

THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS IN THE WRITINGS OF ATHANASIUS

by

John Jay Brogan

Department of Religion
Duke University

Date: March 28, 1997

Approved:

D. Moody Smith, Co-Supervisor

Bart D. Ehrman, Co-Supervisor

Dale B. Martin

Elizabeth Clark

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Religion in the Graduate School of Duke University

1997

Ph.D.
B866T
1997

ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a text-critical study of the text of the four Gospels found in the writings of Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria (c. 296-373 C.E.). The issues addressed are: (1) the collection of his Gospels-text, (2) the textual character of that text, and (3) the information it provides for reconstructing the history of the New Testament text in Alexandria.

Before providing and analyzing his Gospels-text, I examine three preliminary issues: (1) how Athanasius' education, the provenance of his writings, and his historico-polemical context influenced his citation techniques; (2) a survey of the scholarly views concerning the origin and transmission of the Alexandrian text; and (3) the methodological difficulties associated with studying Athanasius' references to the Gospels.

The dissertation contains the complete text of every citation, adaptation, and allusion to the Gospels as found within critical editions of genuine Athanasian writings. A critical apparatus provides the results of collating these references with representative witnesses from each of the major New Testament text-types. Indeterminable Gospel references, references found in Athanasian writings unavailable in critical editions, and references found in the Greek catenae are provided in separate appendices.

Based upon the collations, a complete quantitative analysis reveals that Athanasius' text is more closely aligned to Alexandrian witnesses than to Byzantine, Caesarean, or Western. A comprehensive group profile analysis indicates that he better represents the Secondary Alexandrian group than Primary Alexandrian.

Athanasius' influence on the text in Alexandria is evident in two areas: (1) in certain instances he corrupted his biblical references for polemical purposes, and (2) his text shows a peculiar alignment to the corrections of Codex Sinaiticus (indicating that some of the variants that Athanasius attests eventually entered into the stream of textual transmission). Leading figures and authors of the early church, such as Athanasius, were influential in providing the frameworks by which to interpret the "meaning" of biblical texts. These interpretive communities included the scribes responsible for copying biblical texts. In certain instances, these scribes (having been influenced by the interpretive frameworks of their communities) changed the wording of the text to make it *read* what they already knew it to *mean.*

Table of Contents

Abstract.....iv

List of Tables.....vii

Acknowledgements.....viii

Chapter 1 Athanasius and the Influences on His Use of the New Testament.....1

Chapter 2 Where Did Athanasius Get His Text? Theories Concerning the Transmission of the New Testament Text in Alexandria.....27

Chapter 3 A Method to the Madness: Collecting, Collating, and Analyzing Patristic Evidence.....57

Chapter 4 The Text of the Gospels of Athanasius and the Critical Apparatus.....78

Chapter 5 Quantitative Analysis.....183

Chapter 6 Profile Analysis.....225

Chapter 7 Athanasius, the Corrections of Sinaiticus, and the Nameless Shapers of the Text.....259

Appendix A Indeterminable Gospel References.....304

Appendix B Gospel References in Athanasius' Writings not Available in Critical Editions.....321

Appendix C Gospel References in *Oratio iii contra Arianos*.....356

Appendix D Gospel References in Greek Catenae.....375

Appendix E Athanasius in the Critical Apparatus of NA^{27} and UBS^{4}.....391

Bibliography.....399

Personal Biography.....428

List of Tables

Table 1 Quantitative Analysis for Matthew.....188

Table 2 Witnesses Ranked by Agreement in Matthew.....190

Table 3 Agreement by Textual Groups in Matthew.....196-97

Table 4 Quantitative Analysis for Luke.....201

Table 5 Witnesses Ranked by Agreement in Luke.....202

Table 6 Agreement by Textual Groups in Luke.....206-7

Table 7 Quantitative Analysis for John.....209

Table 8 Witnesses Ranked by Agreement in John.....210-11

Table 9 Agreement by Textual Groups in John.....217-18

Table 10 Agreement by Textual Groups in Matthew, Luke, and John.....221-22

Table 11 Inter-Group Readings.....234

Table 12 Intra-Group Readings.....241

Table 13 Combined Inter- and Intra-Group Readings.....244

Table 14 Witnesses Ranked by Support of Alexandrian Uniform Distinctive/Exclusive/Primary Readings.....248

Table 15 Witnesses Ranked by Support of Alexandrian Predominant Distinctive/Exclusive/Primary Readings.....250

Table 16 Inter-Group Readings (with Primary and Secondary Alexandrian Witnesses Split).....254

Table 17 Intra-Group Readings (with Primary and Secondary Alexandrian Witnesses Split).....256

Table 18 Combined Inter- and Intra-Group Readings (with Primary and Secondary Alexandrian Witnesses Split.....258

Table 19 Witness Ranked by Agreement with $\aleph^{c}$ against $\aleph^{*}$ in Units of Significant Variation.....287

Acknowledgements

The "black-hole" of dissertation-writing often threatened to overwhelm me and sweep my hopes away. Now that I have finally finished, I would like to express my appreciation to a number of people. These people supported, encouraged, and prodded me to completion.

I cannot begin to thank Bart Ehrman, the "hands-on" co-advisor of this dissertation, enough. He continued to push me to continue my work (when I felt like quitting) and to produce the best material possible (when I wanted to merely "get by"). At times, I thought I would never attain the level he demanded. His numerous requests for "re-writes" drove me crazy, but in the end, I am thankful that he recognized my ability and pushed me to perform to my best. I am proud to be his student, and pleased to call him my friend.

The members of my dissertation committee have been extremely helpful. D. Moody Smith (my other co-advisor) guided me through graduate courses and doctoral exams. He is an excellent example of a scholar and mentor who carries himself with grace and humility. I was Dale Martin's research and teaching assistant for four years at Duke. He honed my critical insight and skills and made me a much better scholar. I hope that I reflect a small measure of his acumen in this work. He has been a wonderful friend to my wife, Kathy, and me. I also thank Elizabeth Clark for

her willingness to participate on my committee and her leadership as Director of Graduate Studies. The committees' input has greatly improved this dissertation.

I have been blessed by numerous friends during this venture who have shared in my joys and struggles. I cannot express in written words the depth of my love and appreciation for Dwight Peterson. Since the first days of graduate school until now, his friendship and support have been one of the few constants in my life. Darrell Gwaltney and I struggled together as we faced the demands of writing our dissertations while tackling our first full-time teaching positions. His sense of humor, skills on the basketball court, and pastoral nature have encouraged me to keep trying. During the past two years, Richard Whitekettle has been my friend me through perhaps the darkest and most difficult days of my life. He exemplifies the meaning of friendship. He has also pored over this manuscript, offering suggestions for improvement that were much needed. To these and other friends who have encouraged and prayed for me, I extend my deepest thanks.

My parents, Robert and Doris Brogan, have always supported my academic pursuits. I appreciate the work ethic they demonstrated and instilled in me. I am thankful for their patience, love, and prayers for me and my family. I am very thankful for loving and supportive parents-in-law, brothers and sisters, and nieces and nephews who

understood when I missed family functions to work on the dissertation.

My children have been my inspiration. Erin's imagination, creativity, and faith have always amazed me. She pushes me to remain "child-like" in my wonder. Joel was born while writing this dissertation. His zest for life helps me to enjoy the simple pleasures even during my busiest times. I have been absent from my family for far too many evenings, weekends, and special events in order to finish this work. Neither of my children know what life without the dissertation is like, but they have continually prayed for its completion! I look forward to exploring post-dissertation life with them.

Finally, I want to express my deep love and appreciation for Kathy, my wife. She has borne the weight of this dissertation more than any other person. She has loved and encouraged me through it all. She has endured my absences, my moodiness, my worries, and my frustrations. She read and critiqued every line of this dissertation. She is an excellent biblical scholar and deserves as much credit for this work as as I do. In Kathy, the characteristics of Christian and scholar, musician and mother, wife and friend are wonderfully woven together, and it is to her that I dedicate this work... with all my love.

CHAPTER 1

ATHANASIUS AND THE INFLUENCES ON HIS USE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Athanasius was one the most important ecclesiastical figures of the fourth century, yet he has been virtually ignored in text-critical studies of the New Testament. Literally hundreds of articles and books have focused on Athanasius' life, theology, and writings, while only a handful of studies have even briefly considered his text of the NT or his impact on its transmission.[1] This oversight represents a significant weakness not only in the field of textual criticism, but also in the fields of church history and theology. In the area of textual criticism, Athanasius' writings provide an important witness to the biblical text in Alexandria in the 4th century CE. In the areas of church history and theology, they provide an excellent example of how leaders within the early church used scripture for polemical purposes and how their

---

[1]Two scholars who analyze portions of Athanasius' text of the Bible are Henric Nordberg, "On the Bible Text of St. Athanasius," in Arctos: Acta Philologica Fennica, Nova Series, vol. 3 (Helsinki: Hesingfors, 1962), 119-41; and Gerassimos Zervopoulos, "The Gospels-Text of Athanasius" (Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1955). The shortcomings of these two studies will be discussed in Chapter 3.

citation practices influenced the form of the biblical text itself.[2]

In this study of Athanasius' text of the Gospels, I will show that just as theology and canon were still in a state of flux during the 4th century, so too was the text of the NT. On the whole, most early Christian authors attempted to preserve the wording of their biblical texts faithfully (providing a datable, geographically identifiable textual witness). At the same time, some authors such as Athanasius helped shape the NT text by

==========

[2]The lack of textual studies of patristic sources in general is partially explained by the emphases of NT textual criticism. Since the principles of textual criticism were first applied to the NT, text critics have focused on (one might better say "have been obsessed with") the reconstruction of the original text. Textual evidence from patristic sources has been given tertiary status behind the testimony of Greek manuscripts and the ancient versions. In the exceptional cases in which patristic evidence has been considered, text critics have tended to focus on patristic writings from the first three centuries. The relative paucity of NT manuscripts dating from the first three centuries makes patristic evidence from that period even more valuable. Furthermore, text critics generally agree that the majority of textual variants originated within the first three centuries CE (see Eldon J. Epp, "The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission," in Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism, ed. Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 277-83, 295-96). Recent decades have seen an increase in the study of Christian authors from the 4th century and later. Not only have significant articles and dissertations (many unpublished) come forth, but several significant studies have been published in the *New Testament in the Greek Fathers* series by the Society of Biblical Literature (SBLNTGF).

means of changing their texts in citations (providing important evidence of the transmission of the NT text).

A reciprocal relationship existed between theology, canon, and text in the first four centuries. Theological controversies and constructions influenced the selection of authoritative writings and, in some places, the wording of the text itself. Canonical lists placed parameters on theological discourse and emphasized the need for copying and disseminating particular texts (to the neglect of other texts). Textual variation permitted different interpretations and theology. Only towards the end of the 4th century and into 5th, as certain parties within the church gained enough political and ecclesiastical power to enforce their views, did a concretization of theology, canon, and text take place.[3]

At the center of this theological-canonical-textual maelstrom in the 4th century was Athanasius - the bishop of Alexandria and champion of what eventually became the

---

[3]The homogeneity of the church's theology, canon, and text even during the 5th century and later should not be overestimated. Differences in all three areas still existed, being preserved by smaller, less-powerful "fringe" groups. Still, one can speak of the fixation of theology in "orthodox" trinitarianism, the fixation of canon in the 27 books of the NT (of which Athanasius' *39th Paschal Letter* is an important witness), and the fixation of text in the emergence and dominance of the Byzantine text form.

"orthodox" trinitarian doctrine.[4] As a leading figure in the church during this period, his citation and interpretation of biblical texts is important for the study of the history and theology of the church. He developed his theology, defended his actions, and denigrated his opponents by citing and interpreting scripture.

In order to formulate a proper understanding of Athanasius' life and teachings, it is necessary to understand his use of scripture. At times, when the polemical situation created the need, he would make changes in the wording of his biblical text to support his arguments. In order to understand his use of scripture and to identify those places where he corrupts his biblical text, one must first describe what the biblical text he inherited looked like. In this way, textual criticism can contribute to the endeavors of historians and theologians.[5]

==========

[4]With reference to the nature of the Son, Athanasius argued for the concept of *homoousios* - put simply, that the Father and Son shared the same essence.

[5]Due to the text-critical nature of this study, several parts delve deeply into textual matters. For the person not trained in textual criticism or the person interested primarily in historical/theological matters, I would suggest reading Chapter 1 carefully, skimming Chapter 2 (history of the Alexandrian text) and Chapters 5-6 (analyses of the text), and refocusing on Chapter 7. Chapter 3 (methodology) and Chapter 4 (text and apparatus) deal primarily with text-critical matters.

These broader objectives highlight the text-critical nature of this study which formulates its three primary goals. The first goal involves the collection, presentation, and collation of all of Athanasius' references to the Gospels (see Chapter 4 and Appendices A, B, C, and D). A proper collection and collation of the textual evidence is necessary to achieve the second goal - analyzing the evidence in order to identify the textual character of Athanasius' Gospel references (see Chapters 5-6). This analysis provides the necessary data for the final and most significant goal - determining what Athanasius' text of the Gospels tells us about the appearance, status, and transmission of the NT text in Alexandria during the fourth century (see Chapter 7). Overall, this text-critical study will provide evidence of what the NT text looked like in 4th-century Alexandria and how that text was evolving in its political and ecclesiastical environment.

Influences on Athanasius' Citation Techniques

Before collecting and analyzing Athanasius' text of the Gospels, it is necessary to understand certain aspects of his background, career, and beliefs that influenced his use of the text. Several things determined the form of scripture available to him and influenced how he went about

citing it. These include: (1) his education, (2) the dates and provenance of his writings, and (3) the polemical situations in 4th-century Alexandria, including political, ecclesiastical, and theological controversies.

Education

Athanasius' education influenced his rhetorical style, his exegetical methodology, and his citation techniques. All of these affect the appearance of his citations and, ultimately, the analysis of his text of the Gospels.

Little is known of Athanasius' early life. He was born at the very end of the third century, most likely between 296-298 CE.[6] The social standing of his parents

---

[6]The dating of Athanasius' birth is tied closely to a passage in *Festal Index* 3 which states that his election to the episcopate (June 8, 328 CE) was challenged on the ground that he had not yet attained the canonical age of thirty. If this is true, then he would have been born sometime after June 298. The challenge could have been a fabrication. Even so, he could not have been much older than 30 when he was appointed bishop. Otherwise his opponents' challenge would have been easily dismissed. Archibald Robertson dates his birth between 296-298 CE [A. Robertson, "Prolegomena," in A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (= NPNF), 2nd Series, St. Athanasius: Select Works and Letters (London: 1892; repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 4:xiv. R.P.C. Hanson states that "most authorities" place his birth in 297 CE [see R.P.C. Hanson, The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 246]. Barnes, believing that the challenge of Athanasius' opponents was true, dates his birth to the summer of 299 [see Timothy Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993) 10].

A later tradition, preserved in a Coptic fragment,

and family is not clear. Accounts of his family's background range from their being poor "pagans" to being wealthy Christians of higher social standing.[7] Whatever his familial background, he secured a relatively high social status as a young man when Alexander, the Bishop of Alexandria, appointed him to be a deacon (circa 319 CE).[8]

==========

states that Athanasius was 33 when he was consecrated bishop (see O. von Lemm, "Koptische Fragmente zur Patriarchengeschichte Alexandriens," in Memoires de l'Academie Imperiale des Sciences de St. Petersbourg 36, no. 11 (1888), p. 20, frag. P.5 (text), p. 36 (translation and discussion). This evidence would place Athanasius' birth in 295 CE. For supporters of this date, see B. Altaner, Patrology, 5th ed., trans. H. Graef (Freiburg: Herder, 1958), 312; Johannes Quasten, Patrology, 4 vols. (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1960), 3:20; and J. Tixeront, A Handbook of Patrology, 4th ed., trans. S.A. Raemers (St. Louis: Herder, 1920), 152. In my opinion, the testimony of the *Festal Index* outweighs this later tradition and thus his birth should be placed between 296-298.

[7]The *History of the Twelve Patriarchs*, a later hagiography about key leaders of the Alexandrian church, states that Athanasius' parents were pagans, but the historical validity of details in this document is highly suspect [see R.P.C. Hanson, The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God, (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1988), 246]. Robertson mentions that "his parents, according to later writers, were of high rank and wealthy," but he provides no sources for this information ("Prolegomena," 4:xiv). In contrast, Barnes states that Athanasius "came from a humble family" from Alexandria (Barnes, Athanasius, 10). In support of this view, Barnes mentions Constantius' ridicule of Athanasius' ignoble origin when Constantius described him as "a man who had come forth from the lowest dens of infamy" (επεκρατει δε ανηρ βαραθρων απο εσχατων ορμωμενος - *Apol. ad Const.* 30.3-4). Even Athanasius' secondary education does not necessarily indicate that he came from a higher level of social status. His education could have been funded under the patronage of Alexander, the bishop.

[8]Rufinus presents a rather fanciful tale of how Alexander discovered the young boy Athanasius baptizing his playmates

Eventually he became Alexander's secretary and trusted assistant. After the death of Alexander, he was appointed bishop of Alexandria.

Athanasius most likely received his education in the catechetical school located in Alexandria.[9] Athanasius describes some of his teachers as "martyrs" for the Christian faith, indicating their employment in the catechetical school.[10] These martyrdoms probably took place during the Great Persecution under the emperors Diocletian and Maximim Daia (303-311 CE). Otherwise, the specific

==========

by the sea (*H.E.*, i.14; see also Socrates, *H.E.* i.15, and Sozomen, *H.E.* ii.16). Alexander took Athanasius and his friends under his care and educated them for sacred service. Although the historical veracity of this story is suspect, it does show the church's tradition concerning a close connection between a youthful Athanasius and the bishop Alexander. The appearance of two deacons named "Athanasius" among a list of deacons in Alexander's *Letter to All Bishops* (circa 321 CE) confirms that Alexander appointed him deacon. For a copy of this letter, see H.G. Opitz, Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites, vol 3, Epistle 3.21.

[9]In order to attain the position of deacon, and especially bishop, Athanasius would have had to receive some sort of catechetical education. For a description of the catechetical school and theological education in Alexandria, see Robert M. Grant, "Theological Education in Alexandria," in The Roots of Egyptian Christianity, ed. Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 178-89.

[10]Athanasius writes,

> But we impart of what we have learned from inspired teachers who have been conversant with them [the Scriptures], who have also become martyrs for the deity of Christ, to your zeal for learning...
> (*De Incarnatione* 56.2; NPNF, 2nd Series, 4:66)

names of his teachers and the dates of his schooling remain unknown.

Gregory of Nazianzus, one of the earliest witnesses to the life of Athanasius, makes the following statement concerning Athanasius' education in his panegyric of Athanasius (circa 380 CE):

> He was brought up, from the first, in religious habits and practices, after a brief study of literature and philosophy, so that he might not be utterly unskilled in such subjects, or ignorant of matters which he had determined to despise. (*Oratio* 21.5)[11]

Gregory's reference to "a brief study of literature and philosophy" describes a typical secondary education.[12] At the primary (or elementary) stage of education, a student

---

[11] NPNF, 2nd Series, 7:270.

[12] A secondary education would have been more extensive than an elementary education in which a student was taught by a "teacher of letters". Stanley Stowers views the distinction between elementary and secondary education as being primarily an issue of social distinction, or in his words, "socially differentiated tracks," [see Stanley K. Stowers, Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity, Library of Early Christianity, 5 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), 32-35]. Elementary schools were attended by the lower classes, whereas upper class boys received secondary education under a *grammaticus*. According to Stowers,

> There was not usually a movement from the 'teacher of letters' to the grammaticus... The instruction of the grammaticus centered on the analysis and imitation of the classics of history, literature, and oratory (Stowers, Letter Writing, 32)

For a detailed discussion of education in Greco-Roman antiquity, see H.I. Marrou, A History of Education in Antiquity, trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), and Stanley F. Bonner, Education in Ancient Rome (London: Methuen, 1977).

learned the mechanics of reading and writing. Those students who were privileged enough to receive a secondary education under a *grammaticus* (γραμματιστής) typically studied set pieces of classical writings (often found in standard anthologies) by means of rote copying and memorization.[13] A secondary level student might also receive a cursory introduction to rhetoric.[14] Only a few students who completed secondary studies under a *grammaticus* went on to further studies under a teacher of rhetoric (σοφιστής).

An examination of Athanasius' writings confirms that his formal education was probably confined to the secondary level. Nothing in his writings indicates anything more than an epitomized knowledge of classical authors.[15] His

---

[13]See Wayne Meeks, The Moral World of the First Christians, Library of Early Christianity, 6 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), 62; and Abraham Malherbe, Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook, Library of Early Christianity, 4 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), 13, 23, 30-31, 105, 109, 115-20. For a discussion of the development of Christian schools and the moral instruction that took place there, see Meeks, Moral World, 114-19.

[14]Stowers describes the level of rhetorical training in secondary education as follows:

> The elementary exercises in rhetoric (*progymnasmata*) were also taught to various degrees in secondary education, although rhetoricians were not inclined to relinquish to the grammarian any but the most elementary exercises (Stowers, Letter Writing, 32)

[15]Athanasius' two-volume work, *Contra Gentes* (= *CG*) and *De Incarnatione Verbi* (= *De Inc.*) shows that he was at least familiar with Greek authors and philosophers. He describes the intellectual and artistic contributions of several

infrequent description of classical authors and allusions to their writings could have been learned by reading any of the popular epitomes of the great classics.[16]

Athanasius' rhetorical skills reveal only a rudimentary knowledge of rhetorical training. In a study

---

classical Greek intellectuals as follows:

> For the Phoenicians invented letters, Homer epic poetry, Zeno of Elea dialectic, Corax of Syracuse rhetoric, Aristaeus bee-keeping, Triptolemus the sowing of corn, Lycurgus of Sparta and Solon of Athens laws, while Palamedes discovered the arrangement of letters, and numbers, and measures and weights. (*CG* 18.3)

Elsewhere, Athanasius alludes to Plato's ideas and writings (*Phaedrus* in *CG* 5.2 and 33.2; *Republic I* in *CG* 10.4; *Legg.* in *CG* 35.4; *Timaeus* in *CG* 41.2 and *De Inc.* 43.4); to the Aristotelian definition of being human (*Top. V.ii-iv* in *CG* 18.3); to Neo-Pythagorean teachings about gods (*CG* 19.3 - possibly referring to Maximus of Tyre or Iamblichus); to writings that contained oracles (see *De Inc.* 47.1); and philosophical theories of Democritus, Epicurus, and Anaxogoras concerning how creation is held together (*De Synodis* 35). On the basis of these, Robertson claims that Athanasius received a "liberal education" and that "his education was that of a Greek" (Robertson, "Prolegomena," 4:xiv). Similar views are held by Altaner, Patrology, 312; Quasten, Patrology, 20; and F. Cayre, Manual of Patrology and History of Theology, trans. H. Howitt (Paris: Desclee, 1936), 336.

[16]Barnes notes that Athanasius could have known that Homer was the inventor of epic poetry without ever reading a single line of his works (Barnes, Athanasius, 241, n. 11). Concerning Athanasius' classical education, Barnes concludes that:

> His education, however, probably did not include close study of the classics of Greek literature... [He] names Plato only three times in the whole of his considerable *oeuvre*, and the three passages which he adduces are three of the most celebrated and widely known passages in antiquity. Most of the passages which were supposed to illustrate his wide learning came from the fourth *Oration against the Arians*, which is not by Athanasius at all (Barnes, Athanasius, 11).

of Athanasius' rhetorical methods, G.C Stead finds several examples where Athanasius uses both the vocabulary and methods of argument found in the rhetorical handbooks of Aphthonius and Theon, as well as examples of all twenty-eight methods of argument (*topoi*) which are listed in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (2.23).[17] Even with this evidence, however, Stead concludes that Athanasius' rhetorical skills are not extensive enough to prove that he was formally trained in rhetoric or that he ever read such handbooks himself. Stead states,

> It is by no means improbable that he had at least a nodding acquaintance with [the rhetorical handbooks]... Even if he made no formal study of rhetorical technique, a man of his intelligence will have absorbed a great deal, simply by imitation, from the writings of Irenaeus, Origen and Eusebius, to name only three; not forgetting the fact that *a fair outline knowledge of the classical Greek philosophers* could have been gained from an attentive study of such a work as Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica.*[18]

Athanasius could have developed this "nodding acquaintance" with rhetorical methods at the secondary level, as Stead himself admits, through reading and studying other, more well-versed Christian authors (which he certainly read in his catechetical training). Even though Athanasius probably did not receive a formal, rhetorical education, he

---

[17]G.C. Stead, "Rhetorical Method in Athanasius," *VC* 30 (1976): 121-37 (see especially 122-28).

[18]Ibid., 121 (italics mine).

still had sufficient rhetorical skills to use his biblical citations for polemical purposes.

An area of Alexandrian scholarship that had a significant impact on the transmission of the NT text in Alexandria was philology. A fairly sophisticated system of textual criticism developed in Alexandria beginning around the fourth century BCE (associated with the imperial library located there).[19] This included the development of critical symbols (σημεῖα), usually placed in the margins, which designated words, phrases, and sentences that were thought to be either repetitious, transposed, later interpolations, or spurious for some reason.[20]

==========

[19]Alexandria was a major intellectual center during the Greco-Roman period. Under the Ptolemies, a museum and royal library were established at which famous scientists, poets, and philologists studied. For a survey of Alexandrian scholarship, see Rudolf Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), especially 171-233. For a discussion of Alexandrian grammar and linguistics see Jan Pinborg, "Classical Antiquity: Greece," in Current Trends in Linguistics, vol. 13, Historiography of Linguistics, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1975), 102-126. For a discussion of Alexandrian scholars and textual criticism of the Homeric texts see M. Van Der Valk, Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad, pt. 2 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964), 1-50; and David Dawson, Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 66-71. Dawson also shows how Alexandrian Jewish scholars and later Clement used the same type of arguments as the classical allegorists and Alexandrian philologists (Dawson, 77-78, 228-31, 236).

[20]Pfeiffer describes the role of Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus (all Alexandrian scholars) in the

These philological and grammatical developments were incorporated into the Christian scholarship of the day. Günther Zuntz describes this influence as follows:

> The philological mind and method then are a Greek contribution to the Christian tradition, and not the least fruitful contribution... In Alexandria at least, philology was in the air... The Greek grammatical tradition and technique was among the pagan achievements by which Alexandria enriched the Christian tradition.[21]

Alexandrian philology also influenced the transmission of biblical text in Alexandria. As Zuntz describes it, philological concerns resulted in,

> ...the thorough and equal supervision of the whole text in all its details, down to the niceties of grammar and spelling, particles and synonyms, which is characteristic of the 'Alexandrian' tradition.[22]

Some of the Alexandrian fathers who preceded Athanasius exhibited philological principles in their writings. Clement both used and criticized his opponents' use of text-critical methods.[23] Origen was extensively trained in

==========

development of textual criticism and the use of text-critical symbols (see Pfeiffer, History of Classical Scholarship, 115-23, 173-81, 218).

[21]Günther Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the *Corpus Paulinum* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 271, 272, 273.

[22]Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles, 269-70.

[23]See Dawson, Allegorical Readers, 228-31, and Zuntz, Text of the Epistles, 272-73.

the Alexandrian philological tradition,[24] as is evident in his production of the *Hexapla* which contains text-critical symbols similar to those found in critical editions of the classical texts.[25]

==========

[24]Zuntz observes that "it would be ludicrous to repeat the well-known facts which show that none the less the latter [Origen] was completely master also of the philological tradition" (Zuntz, Text of the Epistles, 272-73).

[25]For discussions of Origen, his Old Testament text, and his text-critical practices on it see D. Barthélemy, "Origène et le texte de l'Ancien Testament," in Etudes d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament, Orbicus, biblicus et orientalis, vol. 21 (Freiburg: Éditions Universitaires, 1978), 203-17; S.P. Brock, "Origen's Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament," in Studia Patristica, vol. 10, pt. 1, ed. F.L. Cross (Berlin: Akadamie-Verlag, 1970), 215-18; Jean Daniélou, Origen, trans. Walter Mitchell (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1955), 133-38; P. Nautin, Origene: Sa vie et son oeuvre, Christianisme Antique, vol. 1 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977), 303-61; Quasten, Patrology, 2:44-45; Joseph W. Trigg, Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third-Century Church (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983), 80-86; Eugene Ulrich, "Origen's Old Testament Text: The Transmission History of the Septuagint to the Third Century, C.E." in Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, ed. C. Kannengiesser and Wm. L. Petersen (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988), 3-33; and John Wright, "Origen in the Scholar's Den: A Rationale for the Hexapla," in Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, 48-62.

Origen makes text-critical comments on the NT in *Comm. Matthaeus* 15.14 and *Ep. Africanus* 5. For discussions of Origen's NT text and his text-critical practices on it see Bart D. Ehrman, Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes, The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen, vol. 1, SBLNTGF 3 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 1-21; Gordon D. Fee, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations," *Bib* 52 (1971) 357-94; idem, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen: The Myth of Early Recension in Alexandria," in New Dimensions in New Testament Study, ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974) 19-45; idem, "Origen's Text of the New

Whereas some of his Alexandrian forebears exhibit text-critical concerns, Athanasius himself appears not to have been trained in nor greatly affected by the Alexandrian philological and text-critical tradition. He rarely makes an argument for one wording of the text over against another, and he never states that one reading is "correct" while another is "incorrect." If his education was limited to a secondary education, he probably never studied the techniques that were developed and taught in the great library.

The aspect of Athanasius' education that had the greatest impact on his citation of scripture is his study of the scripture itself. Gregory gushes,

> From meditating on every book of the Old and New Testament, with a depth such as none else has applied even to one of them, he grew rich in contemplation, rich in splendour of life... (*Oration* 21.6)[26]

==========

Testament and the Text of Egypt," *NTS* 28 (1982) 348-64; Bruce Metzger, "Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts," in Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey, ed. J. Neville Birdsall and R.W. Thomson (Freiburg, 1963), 78-95; William L. Petersen, "The Text of the Gospels in Origen's Commentaries on John and Matthew," in Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, 34-47.

[26]NPNF, 2nd Series, 7:270. Barnes concurs with Gregory's assessment stating that,

> Athanasius received a thorough grounding in the scriptures and in biblical exegesis, which formed the basis of his thought and writings throughout his life (Barnes, Athanasius, 11).

Robertson also recognizes the centrality of biblical studies in Athanasius' education, stating,

Athanasius' writings provide evidence of his immersion in scripture. His apologetic and theological treatises are filled not only with scriptural citations and adaptations, but also with the language and imagery of scripture in general. Given the central role of memorization in the Greco-Roman educational process, it is likely that Athanasius memorized extensive portions of scripture as a youth. As an adult, when he used scripture extensively in his writings, it is likely that he cited the biblical text from memory. Since he usually cites only short passages of scripture, there would be little need for him to consult a biblical manuscript for purposes of accuracy.

Citation from memory has two contrasting effects on the appearance of the biblical text. On the one hand, it increases the number of alterations to the "parent" text due to errors of memory.[27] These alterations result in a

---

> But from early years another element had taken first place in his training and in his interest. It was in the Holy Scriptures that his martyr teachers had instructed him, and in the Scripture his mind and writings are saturated... his knowledge of the Old Testament is limited to the Septuagint. But of it, as well as of the New Testament, he has an astonishing command, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λόγιος, δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. The combination of Scriptural study and of Greek learning was what one expects in a pupil of the famous Alexandrian School...("Prolegomena," 4:xiv)

[27]In the case of citation from memory, the "parent" text is the text that the author memorized.

less "pure" text. Errors of memory include word omissions, substitutions, mixed or harmonized passages, or the addition of explanatory material. On the other hand, citation from memory has a stabilizing effect on the textual character of the citations. Early church authors who cite from memory always refer back to the same "parent" text, regardless of the time or place in which they are writing.

In summary, Athanasius' education did affect his citation of scripture. He developed his theology based on the scriptures that he studied so thoroughly as a youth. He learned enough rhetoric to utilize scripture for his polemical purposes. He cited short passages from memory, making changes in his biblical text when needed. His lack of training (and disinterest?) in philological matters caused him to be freer in his citations of the text.

Date and Provenance of Athanasius' Writings

Some of the early church authors lived and worked in different areas during their lifetimes. Others travelled extensively and wrote in different locations. Such movement could have affected the form of text the author cited.[28] For example, if an author did not have his own

---

[28]The most well known example of this phenomenon is Origen. Textual critics have frequently noted the need to

biblical texts with him and could not recall a biblical text from memory, he would be forced to consult a biblical manuscript available at that locale. The textual character of these local manuscripts could differ substantially from the "normal" text learned by the author. Thus, the textual character of a writer's biblical citations could vary from work to work. As a result, it is important to examine the time and place of each author's writings to determine if these factors affected the form of the biblical text cited.

Athanasius did not reside in Alexandria his entire life as his career as bishop of Alexandria was interrupted by five known periods of exile. During these exiles, he took refuge in such places as Trier (July 335 - Nov 337 CE); Rome-Milan-Trier-Naissus-Aquileia (April 339 - Oct 346 CE); the deserts of Upper and Lower Egypt (Feb 356 - Feb 362 CE); Upper Egypt (Oct 362 - Feb 363 CE); and the area outside of Alexandria (Oct 365 - Feb 366 CE).[29] Since Athanasius wrote several of his works while in exile, a

---

distinguish his earlier writings (while in Alexandria) from his later ones (while in Caesarea). Some textual scholars have connected the emergence of the "Caesarean Text" with Origen's move to Caesarea. Hopefully, the forthcoming textual analysis of Origen's text of the Fourth Gospel by Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes will shed some light on this important question.

[29]While the dates and places of Athanasius' exiles are generally agreed upon, the dates and places of origin of several of his writings are highly disputed.

question arises whether he cited a different form of the NT text while in exile than when residing in Alexandria.

In Athanasius' case, the textual analysis reveals that the textual character of his Gospel references is consistent throughout his writings.[30] This consistency is most likely due to the fact that Athanasius cited from memory, although it is possible that he took copies of his biblical texts with him during periods of exile, or that he used local manuscripts that were similar in textual character to the text he learned in Alexandria, or a combination of the above possibilities.[31]

==========

[30]In order to determine whether or not the textual character of Athanasius' citations changed from writing to writing (dependent upon time and place of origin), I first identified the "normal" textual character of Athanasius' text of the Gospels by analyzing all the Gospel references found in all of his writings together (see Chapter 5). I then examined the textual character of the citations in each writing individually. There were no dramatic departures from this "norm" in any particular writing.

[31]Analysis of individual writings of an early church author will clarify the textual character of her citations. Furthermore, such an analysis could provide information about dates, provenance, and even authenticity of those writings. For example, if it is shown that an author typically cites one form of the NT text, but that in a particular writing cites a different form, this analysis provides additional evidence concerning the provenance and/or authenticity of that writing. In the case of Athanasius' writings, it would be interesting to see if the biblical citations in the dubious and spurious works *Orationes iii-iv contra Arianos* reveal a different textual character than the genuine *Orationes i-ii*.

The Polemical Setting of Fourth-Century Alexandria

Athanasius lived in a period of tremendous political, ecclesiastical, and theological controversy. Alexandria and its leaders played pivotal roles in the outcomes of many of these battles. As the main Mediterranean port of Egypt, Alexandria was one of the major economic centers of the entire empire.[32] As one of the oldest and most well-respected sees of the church (combined with the intellectual heritage of the city), the Alexandrian church played an important role in the development of Christian doctrine. As bishop of Alexandria, Athanasius' participation in the controversies of the period was extremely influential. The polemical situations of his life influenced the types of writings he produced and the means by which he cited and used scripture.

Among church authors after the mid-2nd century, the most reliable textual evidence is found in biblical

---

[32]Egypt was one of the main suppliers of grain for the Roman empire (see M.J. Hollerich, "The Alexandrian Bishops and the Grain Trade: Ecclesiastical Commerce in Late Roman Egypt," Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient 25 (1982): 187-207). Athanasius was embroiled in the economic politics of Egypt and the empire. In *Apologia contra Arianos* 87.1, he records that his enemies have accused him of threatening to withhold the shipment of grain from being sent to Constantinople. Earlier in this writing, he states that he has been accused of selling grain designated for distribution to the poor and embezzling the profits (*Apologia contra Arianos* 18.2). Athanasius denies both of these charges.

commentaries.[33] In commentaries, authors frequently listed the entire biblical passage and then commented on particular words or phrases in their interpretations. This repetition of words and phrases makes the reconstruction of the actual wording of the author's biblical text quite certain. Unfortunately, if Athanasius wrote any biblical commentaries, none of them has been preserved.[34] An Athanasian commentary would have provided the most substantial text-critical evidence for establishing the character of his text of the Gospels.

A survey of Athanasius' writings demonstrates that most can be labeled as either apologetical, dogmatic, historico-polemical, ascetical, or under the broad category of letters.[35] His writings are filled with rhetorical and

==========

[33]The practice of writing New Testament commentaries might have been introduced by Gnostic authors such as Basilides (fl. c. 135 CE) and Heracleon (fl. c. 145-180CE) (see Joseph W. Trigg, Biblical Interpretation, Message of the Fathers of the Church, 9 (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988), 20). Some of the earliest "orthodox" commentaries were written by Hippolytus (c. 170-236 CE) and Origen (c. 185-254 CE).

[34]Quasten mentions that fragments from Athanasius' commentaries on Psalms, Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs, and Genesis have been preserved in catenae (Quasten, Patrology, 39-39). The authenticity of many of these fragments is doubtful. According to Quasten, fragments on Job, Matthew, Luke, and 1 Corinthians found in the catenae "are not from lost commentaries on these books but from other works of St. Athanasius, perhaps from sermons no longer extant. No ancient author ever mentions that Athanasius wrote commentaries on any part of the New Testament" (ibid., 39).

[35]These are the classification used by Quasten, Patrology,

polemical elements. He defends his own actions[36] and the actions and beliefs of other pro-Nicene colleagues.[37] He attacks his enemies' actions and/or their false doctrines.[38] He warns his readers to avoid false doctrine and calls them to action so that they will defend him or the Nicene confession.[39] He expounds "correct" doctrine.[40] In all of these situations, Athanasius' goal is to convince his readers of the correctness of his position and the errors of his opponents'.

Athanasius' predominant theological battle was over christology. He maintained an unswerving devotion to *homoousios* christology - that the Son of God was "of the

==========

24-66.

[36]See *Apologia contra Arianos*, *Apologia ad Constantium imperatorem*, *Apologia pro fuga sua*. As Quasten observes, these defenses often go beyond the justification of his own or others' actions to "the condemnation of his enemies' conduct." (Patrology, 34)

[37]See *Epistula de decretis Nicaenae synodi*, *Epistula de sententia Dionysii episcopi Alexandrini*, *Epistula de synodis Arimini et Seleuciae in Isauria celebratis*.

[38]See *Oratio contra gentes*, *Orationes contra Arianos*, *Historia Arianorum ad monachos*, *Epistula ad Adelphium episcopum et confessorem*.

[39]See *Epistula ad Afros episcopos*, *Epistula ad episcopos encyclica*, *Epistula encyclica ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae*, *Epistula ad Maximum philosophum*, *Epistula ad Rufianum episcopum*, *Epistula ad monachos*.

[40]See *Oratio de incarnatione Verbi*, *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, *Epistula ad Jovianum imperatorem*, *Epistulae IV ad Serapionem episcopum Thmuitanum*, *Epistula ad Epictetum episcopum Corinthi*,

same essence" as the Father. He vehemently attacked the Arians who argued that the Son was a created being and did not share in the Father's essence.[41] His thorough study of the scriptures was central to his thought and argumentation. In his polemic against the Arians, Athanasius cited biblical texts that supported his christology as well as refuted the Arians' interpretation of other passages.[42] As will be shown, in some instances Athanasius "corrupted" his biblical text in order to support his theology and/or strengthen his arguments (see Chapter 7).[43]

==========

[41]The Arians were not the only group to suffer Athanasius' wrath. He also attacked the Meletians and Jews on several occasions. In my examination of Athanasius' writings, these two groups do not seem to influence Athanasius' selection and adaptation of scriptural citations to the extent that the Arians did. Several of his polemical pieces are directed against the Arians and frequently his apologetical treatises refute charges made against him by the Arians. His arguments with the Meletians and Jews are usually framed within his battles against the Arians. For a discussion of Athanasius' conflict with the Meletians, see L.W. Barnard, "Athanasius and the Meletian Schism," *JEA* 59 (1973): 181-89.

[42]Charles Kannengiesser argues that the Arian christological controversy was primarily a difference in hermeneutical approaches to the scripture (see Charles Kannengiesser, Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: The Arian Crisis (Berkeley: Center for Hermeneutical Studies, 1982); repr. in Arius and Athanasius: Two Alexandrian Theologians, (Hampshire, Great Britain: Variorum, 1991).

[43]Bart Ehrman demonstrates that "orthodox" scribes "corrupted" their scriptures in order to present and/or defend their christological positions (see Bart D. Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early

The implication of the political, ecclesiastical, and theological contexts of Athanasius' life on his citation and use of scripture is that most of his biblical references appear in polemical arguments rather than extended exegetical treatments.[44] These polemical contexts permit Athanasius to be "freer" in his citation of the Bible. He does not attempt to interpret large sections of scripture, and he rarely cites extended passages. Instead, he often uses "proof-texts," that is, short passages of scripture that support his actions or theological views. As mentioned above, it is more likely that he cited these short passages from memory than that he consulted a manuscript. These citations from memory are much more likely to be "corrupted" in order to fit his theological or polemical contexts. After gathering and analyzing Athanasius' references to the Gospels, I will examine several examples in which Athanasius has made changes in his biblical text for polemical purposes (see Chapter 7).

==========

Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament [Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1993]). I will apply this notion of "corruption" to the biblical citations of Athanasius.

[44]For a discussion of Athanasius' exegesis of the scripture and how he used scripture in polemical contexts, see James D. Ernest, "Athanasius of Alexandria: The Scope of Scripture in Polemical and Pastoral Context," *VC* 47 (1993): 341-62.

Conclusion

This chapter has raised several questions concerning the study of Athanasius' text of the Gospels. Similar difficulties stand in the way of studying the biblical text of any early church author. The collection and analysis of patristic evidence involves more than merely listing, collating, and analyzing an author's biblical references. Each author was influenced by his or her social, political, and theological environment. For each author, the possible influences may differ and should be determined by closely examining the person's background and writings. These influences determine how the author cited the biblical text and must be considered when analyzing that text. Only then can definitive conclusions be made about the textual character of the biblical text and the use of that text.

CHAPTER 2

WHERE DID ATHANASIUS GET HIS TEXT?

THEORIES CONCERNING THE TRANSMISSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT IN ALEXANDRIA

Athanasius as Witness to the Transmission of the Text

As stated in the first chapter, one of the major goals of this study is to incorporate the analysis of Athanasius' text of the Gospels into the history of the NT text in general, and the transmission of the Alexandrian text in particular. Athanasius' temporal and geographical placement is strategic. Temporally, Athanasius appears after the earliest witnesses of the Alexandrian text (P^{66} P^{75} Clement and Origen), contemporaneous to some of the major Alexandrian witnesses (ℵ B and Didymus), and before many of the later witnesses (C L Ψ 33 579 892 and Cyril). Geographically, Athanasius spent the major portion of his career in Alexandria, the academic, cultural, and ecclesiastical center of Egypt. While the use of the Alexandrian text-type was not limited to Alexandria, this text-type certainly existed in Alexandria as is evident from the writings of Origen and Didymus.[1]

---

[1]While it is impossible to identify with certainty the place of origin of any of the papyri or uncials that contain an Alexandrian form of the text, it is likely that

Since Athanasius is a textual witness from Alexandria, the analysis and classification of his biblical text (the first major goal of this study) is very important. Since Athanasius' text is best classified as "Alexandrian" (see Chapters 5 and 6), he is an important witness to the form of that text in Alexandria in the mid-4th century.[2] His similarities to and differences from other Alexandrian

==========

at least some of them are of Egyptian, and possibly even Alexandrian, provenance. Several factors lead to this conclusion. Most, if not all, the papyri have been dsicovered in Egypt, inlcuding the Oxyrhynchus papyri, the Chester Beatty papyri (P^{45} P^{46} P^{47}), the Coptos papyri (P^{4} P^{64} P^{67}- all which probably come from the same papyrus), and the Bodmer papyri (P^{66} P^{72} P^{75}). It is likely that at least some of these papyri were produced in Egypt, possibly even in Alexandria. Furthermore, several of these papyri contain a form of text that is closely related to that found in the writings of Alexandrian fathers such as Clement, Origen, and Didymus. For example, see Gordon Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen: The Myth of Textual Recension in Alexandria," in New Dimensions in New Testament Studies, ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 19-45; repr. in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism SD 45 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 247-73. Regardless of their place of origin, the Alexandrian witnesses themselves prove the existence of the Alexandrian text in its various forms through the early (and later) centuries.

[2]Indeed, if Athanasius' text could not be classified as "Alexandrian," then this would raise serious questions as to why a leading figure of the church from Alexandria would not exhibit an Alexandrian form of text, especially given the fact that Didymus, one of his Alexandrian contemporaries, does preserve such a text (see B. Ehrman, Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels, SBLNTGF, no. 1, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 187-253).

witnesses provide evidence of how the Alexandrian text was evolving during this period.

The Alexandrian Text

In order to see how the analysis of Athanasius' text might affect our understanding of the Alexandrian text and its transmission, a brief overview of the various theories concerning the identification and formation of the Alexandrian text-type is necessary. Text-critical scholars have advanced two major views (each containing numerous sub-views) concerning the history of the NT text in Alexandria: (1) the Alexandrian text represents a recension of the NT made in Alexandria sometime between the 2-4th centuries; (2) the Alexandrian text represents a carefully preserved text (presumably of the original text) that is not a recension.[3] A "recension" is defined as a work of deliberate criticism by an editor or group of editors that produces a new form of text, often with the intention to

---

[3]For brief surveys of the various theories concerning the transmission of the NT text in Alexandria, see Gordon Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," 19-23; Carlo Martini, Il problema della recensionalita del codice B alla luce del papiro Bodmer XIV, AnBib 26 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), 1-41; idem, "Is There a Late Alexandrian Text of the Gospels?" *NTS* 24 (1977-78): 286-91; J.C. O'Neill, "The Study of the New Testament," in Nineteenth Century Religious Thought in the West, ed. Vivian Smart, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 143-78.

improve the text in some way.[4] In the following, I will provide a survey of various opinions concerning the Alexandrian text. I will present the material chronologically, but most of the scholars can be placed within one of the two broad categories described above. In other words, most of the scholars understand the Alexandrian text to be either a result of recensional work or the product of a carefully preserved text. In Chapter 7, I will use the results of the textual analyses of Athanasius' text of the Gospels to see what light is shed on the formation and transmission of the text in Alexandria.

==========

[4]Calvin Porter defines a "recension" as "the text created, according to specific principles, for use in one segment of the church" (see C. Porter, "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P^{75}) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus," *JBL* 81 (1962): 364). Some confusion exists in the use of the term "recension." Some scholars use it synonymously with "family" to refer to a group of closely related textual witnesses. According to Marvin Vincent, Johann Semler was the first person to apply the term "recension" to a group of NT witnesses (Marvin Vincent, A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1903), 92; see also Bruce Metzger, The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration, 3rd enlarged edition, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 115, n. 2). Both Vincent and Metzger point to Semler's work *Hermeneutische Vorbeitung*, iii (I), (Halle: n.p., 1765). If I refer to another person's use of the term "Recension" as synonymous with "family," I will indicate it by using an upper-case "R". Otherwise, I will use the term "recension" (lower-case "r") to describe a deliberately edited text.

Bengel, Semler, and Griesbach: The Alexandrian Text as a Recension of Origen

Most scholars identify Johann Bengel (1687-1752) as the first critic to develop the idea of grouping texts together according to their textual character. Describing Bengel's contributions, F.H.A Scrivener states,

> In his fertile mind sprang up the germ of that theory of *families* or *recensions*, which was afterwards expanded by J.S. Semler [1725-91] and grew to such formidable dimensions in the skillful hands of Griesbach.[5]

Scrivener goes on to state that Bengel desired,

> to reduce all extant testimony into 'companies, families, tribes, and nations'... and to divide all extant documents into two nations: the *Asiatic*, chiefly written in Constantinople and its neighborhood, which he was inclined to disparage, and the *African*, comprising the few of a better type.[6]

Bengel further divided the *African* nation into two tribes: one represented by Codex Alexandrinus and the other by the Old Latin witnesses.[7] Bengel's description of "nations" of texts is similar to the modern classifications of "Byzantine" and "Alexandrian" text-types.

---

[5]F.H.A. Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, 4th ed., vol. 2 (London: George Bell & Sons, 1894), 211.

[6]Scrivener, Introduction, 212, citing J.A. Bengel, "Apparatus Criticis," Novum Testamentum Graecum, 2nd ed., (n.p., 1763), 669.

[7]See Vincent, History, 89; Metzger, Text, 112.

Johann S. Semler (1725-1791) was evidently the first text critic to identify an "Alexandrian" text-type and speak of an "Alexandrian recension." Semler built upon the textual theory of Bengel. At first, he adopted Bengel's two "nations" of texts, renaming them the Eastern or Oriental Recension (= Bengel's *Asiatic*), which Semler claimed stemmed from a recension by Lucian in the fourth century, and the Western or Egypto-Palestinian Recension (= Bengel's *African*), which stemmed from a recension by Origen (presumably from the late 2nd to early 3rd centuries).[8] Later, Semler expanded Bengel's two categories into three: (1) the Alexandrian recension, derived from Origen and preserved in the Egyptian fathers as well as in the Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic versions, (2) the Eastern recension, used in Antioch and Constantinople, and (3) the Western recension, preserved by the Latin versions and Fathers.[9]

==========

[8]This description of Semler's early view concerning the two textual "Recensions" is described by several scholars including Vincent, History, 92-93; F.G. Kenyon, A Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, (London: Macmillan & Co., 1912), 280-81; idem, The Text of the Greek Bible, 3rd ed., revised and augmented by A.W. Adams, (London: Duckworth, 1975), 177; Metzger, Text, 115; and O'Neill, "The Study of the NT," 148.

[9]For a description of Semler's later classifications, see Vincent, History, 93; Kenyon, Textual Criticism, 280-81; idem, Text of the Greek Bible, 177; Metzger, Text, 115; Martini, "A Late Alexandrian Text?" 286-87; and O'Neill, "The Study of the NT," 148. In footnotes, both Metzger and Martini cite Semler's *Apparatus ad liberalem Novi Testamenti interpretationem*, (Halle: n.p. 1767), 45ff.

Johann J. Griesbach (1745-1812) expanded upon the classifications of Bengel and Semler. Like Semler, he divided the NT witnesses into three recensions: (1) the Alexandrian recension, the standard of which is found in Origen but is also evident in the uncials A (Paul), B, C, L, and K; the minuscules 1, 13, 33, 69, 102, 106, 118, 124 131, 157; the Coptic (Bohairic), Ethiopic, Armenian, and the Philoxenian Syriac; and in the quotations of Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Isodore of Pelesium;[10] (2) the Western recension, derived

---

[10]Johann J. Griesbach, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 3rd ed., vol. 1, emended and expanded by D. David Shulz (Berolini: Friedrich Laue, 1827), "Prolegomena," lxx-lxxi (Schulz notes that the "Prolegomena" is taken from Griesbach's 2nd edition). Griesbach produced the first volume of his 2nd edition in 1796 and the second volume in 1806. In his 2nd edition, Griesbach had access to Codex Vaticanus (B) in collation form for the first time, which he classified as an Alexandrian witness. Several of the other leading Alexandrian witnesses, including ℵ and all the papyri, were not available to Griesbach (see G.D. Kilpatrick, "Griesbach and the Development of Text Criticism," in J.J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies, 1176-1976, ed. B. Orchard and T.R.W. Longstaff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 136; and Martini, "A Late Alexandrian Text?" 287). Also in his 2nd edition, Griesbach distinguished different "recensions" within Codex A - Constantinopolitan in the Gospels; Alexandrian in the Pauline Epistles; and Western in Acts and the General Epistles (Griesbach, *Novum Testamentum*, "Prolegomena," lxxi). For surveys of Griesbach's text-critical developments and contributions see in addition to Kilpatrick and Martini mentioned above, Scrivener, Introduction, 222-26; Metzger, Text, 119-21; O'Neill, "Study of the NT," 148-49; Vincent, History, 99-104; and Lyle O. Bristol, "New Testament Textual Criticism in the Eighteenth Century," *JBL* 69 (1950): 110-12.

from Tertullian and represented by codex D; the Latin, the Peshitta (Jerusalem) Syriac, the Sahidic, and the Arabic versions; and the Latin Fathers (including Tertullian);[11] and (3) the Byzantine (or Constantinopolitan) recension, represented by A (partially), the majority of uncials and minuscules, and a large proportion of the later versions and Fathers.[12] Griesbach thought that the Western Recension, which contained several glosses, represented a very early text which suffered errors at the hands of copyists.[13] The Alexandrian recension was an attempt to revise the Western text and contained several corrections of grammar and style.[14] These two groups were distinct from

==========

[11]Griesbach, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 3rd ed., vol. 1, "Prolegomena," lxxi. In describing Griesbach's view, O'Neill claims that his Western text was "not only the recension of Tertullian adopted in the West, but also a text found in the East..." (O'Neill, "The Study of the NT," 148). Griesbach's statement is ambiguous as to whether he thought that Tertullian was *responsible for* producing the Western recension or whether Tertullian simply *used* a text related to that recension.

[12]Griesbach, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 3rd ed., vol. 1, "Prolegomena," lxxi.

[13]Griesbach, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 3rd ed., vol. 1, "Prolegomena," lxxiii-lxxiv. See also Vincent, History, 101; Bristol, "NT Textual Criticism," 110.

[14]See Griesbach, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 3rd ed., vol. 1, "Prolegomena," lxxiii-lxxiv. Bristol describes Griesbach's comparison of the Western and Alexandrian groups as follows:

> The Western text used harsher language, abounding in Hebraisms, errors in style, and unpleasant sounds; the Alexandrian text was careful to avoid and change everything that would be offensive to Greek ears.

one another by the end of the 2nd century, around the time of Origen. The Constantinopolitan recension arose from the two earlier recensions. According to Griesbach, it agreed primarily with the Alexandrian, but it attempted to improve the style of the Greek, it included some of the Western glosses, and it sometimes conflated Western and Alexandrian readings.[15] Since it was a much later text, Griesbach gave the Constantinopolitan recension very little weight in textual matters.[16]

==========

> Moreover, the Western text attempted to make the meaning clear by adding interpretations, paraphrases, and even by changing the words and thoughts, while the Alexandrian strove to give the correct sentences and words rather than the meaning. Again, whereas the Western recension was partial to readings that were longer and more explanatory, even to the extent of supplementing the text by words taken from parallel places, and whereas omissions were considered permissible to clarify obscurities and incongruities, the Alexandrian was much more moderate in such instances. Griesbach's summary of these two recensions was that the Alexandrian was concerned more with grammar, while the Western was interested in interpretation.
> (Bristol, "NT Textual Criticism," 111).

[15]Griesbach, *Novum Testament Graece*, 3rd ed., vol. 1, "Prolegomena," lxxiv. See also Bristol, "NT Textual Criticism," 111.

[16]Because Griesbach slighted the Byzantine text (the basis of the *Textus Receptus*), he was soundly criticized by Scrivener. After describing Griesbach's method of placing textual witnesses into groups and deciding textual matters on the basis of group readings, Scrivener states:

> It is not that such a mode of conducting critical enquiries would not be very convenient, that Griesbach's theory is universally abandoned by modern scholars, but because there is no valid reason for believing it to be true... The joint testimony of two

Viewed together, the earliest recension theories of Bengel, Semler, and Griesbach all argued that the Alexandrian text was a result of a recension, most likely attributable to Origen, sometime in the late 2nd century. None of these scholars addressed the distinctions between the Alexandrian witnesses, and none of them dealt with Athanasius' text to any great extent.[17]

==========

> classes was, *ceteris paribus*, always to prevail; and since the very few documents which comprise the Alexandrian and Western recensions seldom agree with the Byzantine even when at variance with each other, the numerous codices which make up the third family would thus have about as much share in fixing the text of Scripture, as the poor citizens whose host was included in one of Servius Tullius' lower classes possessed towards counterbalancing the votes of the wealthy few that composed his first or second. (Scrivener, Introduction, 224-25)

His criticism notwithstanding, Scrivener still respected Griesbach highly. Scrivener claims that Griesbach was not too rigid in applying his text-critical principles and that he did his work as an editor "with a calmness and sagacity which may well be called judicial" (ibid., 225). Scrivener concludes,

> His industry, his moderation, his fairness to opponents, who (like Matthaei) had shown him little forbearance, we may imitate to our profit. His logical acuteness and keen intellectual perception fall to the lot of a few... (ibid., 226)

[17]Even the great classicist, Richard Bentley (1662-1742), apparently ignored the evidence provided by Athanasius, even though he wanted to reproduce the NT text as it appeared at the Council of Nicaea. Bentley desired to publish a new edition of the Greek and Latin New Testaments "not according to the recent and interpolated copies, but as represented in the most ancient and venerable MSS in Greek and Roman capital letters" (see Richard Bentley, Η Καινη Διαθηκη *Graece*, *Novum Testamentum Versionis Vulgate*, "Proposals for Printing," in The Works of Richard Bentley, D.D., vol. 3, ed. Alexander Dyce, (London: Francis

Johann L. Hug: The Alexandrian Text as a Recension of Hesychius

Johann L. Hug (1765-1846) was the next textual critic to make a significant contribution to the recension theory. The greatest weakness in Griesbach's classifications was his definition of the Western group as a recension comparable to the Alexandrian or Byzantine recensions. Hug understood the Western text to be a mixed group of manuscripts which exhibited an early form of the text that had degenerated because of errors and changes introduced by early copyists and readers. According to Hug,

> The ancients called the text of this first period... κοινη εκδοσις, *vulgaris editio*, in which the private judgment and peculiar opinions of each reader and transcriber were left so free and unshackled, that at last positive necessity occasioned a revision of the text in different provinces... We shall be justified in calling this state up to the emendations, which took place in the third century, the epoch of the κοινη εκδοσις.[18]

==========

Macpherson, 1838; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1966), 487). Bentley states that,

> He has retrieved (except in a very few places) the true exemplar of Origen, which was the standard to the most learned of the *Fathers*, at the time of the Council of Nicaea and two centuries after (Bentley, "Proposal," 488).

Unfortunately, Bentley never completed his edition. Had he been successful in doing so, he would have provided the text that was available to Athanasius. For an excellent biography of Bentley's life and his desire to produce a new edition of the Greek New Testament, see R.J. White, Dr. Bentley: A Study in Academic Scarlet, (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1965), especially 177-88, 195-96, 202-204.

[18]Johann L. Hug, An Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament, vol. 1, tr. Daniel G. Wait (London: C. & J.

The primary example of this "common edition" could be seen in Codex Bezae (D).[19] In Hug's reconstruction, the wish for revision of the text was so broad and the desire to introduce order into the text so strong that three individuals in three different locations completed revisions of the text during the mid-to-late third century. He attributed these recensions to Origen in Palestine, Hesychius in Egypt, and Lucian in Syrian Antioch.[20] Origen, was the first to complete a recension of the NT.[21] In the Gospels, his recension is represented by A K M and a few cursive mss.[22] Origen's recension represents a mixture of readings which would later characterize the Egyptian and Constantinopolitan recensions.[23] Hesychius produced the

==========

Rivington, 1827), 137-38. Hug's work was extremely influential and was published in four German editions [J.L. Hug, Einleitung in die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, 4th ed., (Tubingen: Stuttgart, 1847), 168 ff].

[19]Hug states that Codex D "has preserved in its peculiar diction the readings of the Fathers and Teachers until the middle of the third century. It is therefore a copy of the κοινη εκδοσις..." (Hug, Writings of the NT, 142).

[20]Ibid., 190-91. Jerome supposedly adopted Origen's recension, but openly criticized the recensions of Hesychius and Lucian.

[21]Hug thought that Origen made use of the κοινη εκδοσις in most of his writings throughout his life and only completed his recension of the NT late in life (ibid., 194-95, 218).

[22]Hug was unable to identify mss that represent Origen's recension in the Book of Acts or the Epistles (ibid., 223).

[23]Ibid., 217-23. Hug admitted that the recension of Origen had the weakest support of the three recensions.

"Alexandrian (or Egyptian) recension" by revising a form of the κοινη εκδοσις (very similar to the text found in D).[24] For the Gospels, the Alexandrian text could be found in mss B C and L as well as Athanasius, Marcus, Macarius, and Cyril of Alexandria.[25] Lucian's recension became the predominant text in Constantinople (represented in the Gospels by E F G H S V and the majority of cursive mss).[26] Hug's identification of the Alexandrian text with the "Hesychian recension" continued to have a significant impact well into the 20th century.[27]

==========

His primary rationale for postulating an Origenian recension seems to be an extrapolation of Origen's critical work on the OT as found in the Hexapla. Hug states:

> If now the text of the Old Testament flowed from that revised by Origen, we may believe, that the case must have been the same with that of the New, especially as both belong to the same ecclesiastical society, viz. the Monophysites. (ibid., 221)

J.G. Eichhorn adopted part of Hug's theory, especially the early and broad existence of the Western text, but rejected the idea of an Origenian recension [see J.G. Eichhorn, Einleitung in das Neue Testament, (Leipzig, 1827)].

[24]Hug, Writings of the NT, 197-203. By collating the Alexandrian text with Codex D, Hug was able to identify Hesychius' "critical conduct." According to Hug, Hesychius (1) removed interpolations that came from harmonies, the Apocrypha, and parallel passages; (2) brought back wordings which were peculiar to each evangelist; (3) rejected many glosses and scholia; (4) restored lost sentences; and (5) preferred "the more elegant and pure in reference to Greek syntax, to the harsher and Hellenistic reading" (Hug saw this as an "unfortunate" critical principle borrowed from "profane literature") (ibid., 199-200).

[25]Ibid., 198.

[26]Ibid., 203-17.

[27]Agreeing with Hug, Wilhelm Bousset held that the

Westcott and Hort: The "Neutral" and "Egyptian" Texts

In 1882, B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort offered an alternative theory concerning the NT text in Alexandria. They argued that two types of text existed in Egypt - a "Neutral" text and an "Alexandrian" text.[28] They did not consider the "Neutral" text, best represented by B and ℵ, to be a true "text-type" (as they considered the Syrian and Western texts to be text-types),[29] nor did the "Neutral"

Alexandrian text was an officially sanctioned recension of the NT produced by Hesychius (represented by B) [see Wilhelm Bousset, "Die Recension des Hesychius," in Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament, TU 11 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1894), 74-110]. Hermann von Soden isolated three forms of text that existed at the beginning of the fourth century, one of which he identified as the "Hesychian form" (represented by ℵ B) [see Hermann F. von Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer altesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte, vol. 1: Teil (Berlin, 1902); vol. 2: Ableitung (Berlin, 1907)]. B.H. Streeter argued for the existence of "local texts" found in Alexandria, Africa and Europe (= Western text), Ephesus, Antioch, and Caesarea [see B.H. Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins (New York: Macmillan Co., 1924), 51-108]. Streeter also thought that two "revised versions" or recensions of the NT were made - one attributable to Lucian (resulting in the Byzantine text) and the other by Hesychius (best represented by B) (Streeter, Four Gospels, 109-127, especially 125).

[28]See B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882; repr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988), 126-32, 166-72, 208-9.

[29]Carlo Martini suggests that for Westcott and Hort, "a distinctive text-type is primarily not a group of manuscripts, but a set of readings" (Martini, "A Late Alexandrian Text?" 289). In order for a reading to be

text represent a recension of earlier texts.[30] Instead, the "Neutral" text preserved a relatively pure line of descent from the original. As such, "neutral" readings could be found in any of the text-types (whether Syrian/Byzantine, Western, or Alexandrian), but were found predominantly in old Egyptian manuscripts and witnesses.[31]

In contrast, the Alexandrian text was a true "text-type." It consists of alterations of the pure text made sometime in the second or early third centuries. Westcott and Hort describe those changes as follows:

> The changes made have usually more to do with language than matter, and are marked by an effort after correctness of phrase. They... not seldom display a delicate philological tact which unavoidably lends them at first sight a deceptive appearance of originality.[32]

The Alexandrian readings can be seen most clearly in C L 33, the Coptic versions, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, and occasionally other Alexandrian Fathers, but no witness

==========

classified as "Alexandrian," it must not only have the support of all or even a majority of this group of witnesses, the reading must also "contrast to other (distinctive) readings" (in this way the readings of different text-types do not overlap), and it must demonstrate "some sign of internal secondary character." (ibid.)

[30]Westcott and Hort, 126-30, 212-27.

[31]Westcott and Hort, 126-30. See also Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, 133-34, and Martini, "A Late Alexandrian Text?," 288.

[32]Westcott and Hort, 131-132.

preserves this text completely.[33] The Alexandrian text does not represent an official recension, but rather represents Alexandrian philological concerns which attempted to make grammatical and stylistic improvements to the Greek of the NT.[34] Westcott and Hort's proposal that two forms of text existed in Egypt was widely accepted among later scholars, although their "Neutral" designation was castigated.[35]

---

[33]Westcott and Hort, 131, 209.

[34]Westcott and Hort deny that Hesychius had a significant impact on the development of the Alexandrian text-type. They state,

> Of the Alexandrian corrections more than one stage can certainly be traced... That Hesychius had no hand in any revision which can have produced them is proved by the occurrence of many of them in Origen's writings, at a much earlier date. But it is quite conceivable that Hesychius made or adopted some eclectic text too short lived to have left recognizable traces of itself in extant evidence...(Westcott and Hort, 182-82)

[35]For example, Bruce Metzger also divides the Alexandrian witnesses into two groups - "Proto-Alexandrian" (which Westcott and Hort had identified as "Neutral") and "Later Alexandrian" (Westcott and Hort's "Alexandrian") (see Metzger, The Text of the NT, 133, 215-16). Metzger does not agree with Hort's evaluation that the Alexandrian text is "Neutral," but follows Zuntz in thinking that "the Alexandrian text was prepared by skillful editors, trained in the scholarly traditions of Alexandria." The text which these editors relied upon "must have already been an ancient text in all important points" (ibid., 215). According to Metzger, although most scholars have abandoned Hort's view that B contains an almost unchanged original text, they still hold that it is "the best ancient recension and the one most nearly approximating the original" (ibid., 216). The "later" form of the Alexandrian text was characterized by a "systematic grammatical and stylistic polishing" (ibid., 216). Metzger describes its characteristic as:

> that which might be expected from the influence of a Greek literary centre - a delicate philological tact in

Kenyon and the Chester Beatty Papyri: Support for a Recensional Theory?

The publication and analysis of several biblical papyri discovered in Egypt made significant contributions to the discussion of the Alexandrian text. The texts of the Chester Beatty Papyri (P^{45} P^{46} P^{47} - circa 200-300 CE) and the Bodmer Papyrus P^{66} (circa 200 CE) were interpreted by several scholars as supporting the recensional view of the Alexandrian text.[36] The "mixed" character of these papyri indicated that the earliest text in Alexandria was "wild" and that later recensional activity "tamed" it into the more literarily acceptable form found in ℵ and B.

In his study of the Chester Beatty papyri, Frederic Kenyon claimed that the papyri's text supported both Hort's

---

> correcting forms, syntax, and in subtle changes made in the interest of attaining a greater degree of polish in language and style (ibid., 133).

Metzger's designations "Proto-" and "Late-Alexandrian" are still widely used among text critics today.

[36]The Chester Beatty Papyri were discovered in 1931 and published by Frederic G. Kenyon in The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, (London: Emery Walker, P^{45} in Vol. II, text (1933), plates (1934); P^{47} in Vol. III, text (1934), plates (1936); and P^{46} in Vol. III, Supplement, text (1936), plates (1937)). P^{66} was discovered in 1952 and published by V. Martin in Papyrus Bodmer II, *Evangile de Jean*, chaps. 1-14 (Cologny-Geneva, 1956), and *Supplement*, chaps. 14-21 (1958); and V. Martin and J.W.B. Barns, *Supplement, nouvelle edition* (1962).

"Neutral" and Western readings.[37] Based on his study of the papyri, Kenyon concluded:

> The papyri of earlier date than B, fragmentary as they are, suffice to show that the B text did not prevail universally in Egypt.. It is evident that in Egypt, as in other parts of the world, texts existed in the third century which were not of the B type.[38]

Based on this conclusion, Kenyon suggested that the text of B was the result of careful "editorial" work. He states,

> But if the B text is not the text of Egypt in general, its claim to uncontaminated descent becomes more difficult, since it would have had to descend by a singularly sheltered channel. This is not impossible, particularly in such a home of scholarship as Alexandria... The character of B is so homogeneous throughout the New Testament... this in itself seems to imply the exercise of editorial selection, and the same editorial activity may well have been extended to the supervision of the text.[39]

==========

[37]Frederic G. Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, Fasciculus I, General Introduction (London: Emery Walker, 1933). Kenyon states that:

> On the one hand, it is not an out-and-out supporter of the 'Neutral' or Vatican type of text; but neither is it, on the other hand, an out-and-out supporter of the 'Western' type. It has stronger affinities with other MSS than the Vaticanus; but it confirms none of the more noticeable readings of the Western text, as are found in Codex Bezae and the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions (Kenyon, Chester Beatty Papyri, 16).

[38]F.G. Kenyon, Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible (London: Oxford University Press, 1933; repr., Munich: Kraus, 1980), 68. Elsewhere, Kenyon states that "the Vatican MS (i.e. B) does not represent a text of original purity dominant in Egypt throughout the second and third centuries" (see Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, 16).

[39]Kenyon, Text of the Greek Bible, 218-19. This represents a refinement of Kenyon's earlier position

At first, Kenyon argued that B and ℵ are descendants of a second- or third-century revision of the NT text (thus pre-dating Hesychius) by someone who utilized the highly developed text-critical methods of the Alexandrian school.[40] Later Kenyon adapted this view, suggesting that B might be an early descendant of a text created by a scholar in the beginning of the fourth century who compared "the best accessible representatives of this tradition."[41]

Fee, P^{66}, and P^{75}: Demolition of the Hesychian Hypothesis

The publication of P^{75} in 1961 challenged the notion that the text of B represents a 3rd-4th century recension.

---

concerning the text of B. In 1912, he held that, "In the B-text, therefore, we may see the results of conscientious protection of the sacred text" (Kenyon, Handbook, 332).

[40]F.G. Kenyon, Recent Developments, 68-69. In seeking to answer the question whether the superiority of the B ℵ text is due to "greater purity of tradition" or to "a higher measure of editorial scholarship," Kenyon preferred the latter explanation, but claimed that "the editor was one who was seeking an original text" (ibid., 81-83, 85). See also, F.G. Kenyon, Text of the Greek Bible, 214-20; and idem, Handbook, 327-334.

[41]F.G. Kenyon, "Hesychius and the Text of the NT," in Memorial Lagrange, ed. Hugues Vincent (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1940), 250. Günther Zuntz held a slightly different view, arguing that the text preserved in B is not the result of work by a single person (as Kenyon suggests), but rather represents the result of a long process in which various editors of the NT text in Alexandria used text-critical means to create the best text possible [see Günther Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition Upon the *Corpus Paulinum* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), 269-276].

Studies of P^{75} by Calvin Porter,[42] Carlo Martini,[43] and Gordon Fee[44] conclusively proved that it contains a text very similar to that of Codex B and that this text existed in Egypt in the second century (thus pre-dating Hesychius). In the words of Gordon Fee, "P^{75} has forever laid to rest the 'Hesychian hypothesis'" concerning the origin of the Egyptian text-type."[45]

Although the analysis of P^{75} excluded the possibility that the P^{75} B text represents a late-third or fourth century recension, it did not address the possibility that the ancestor to the P^{75} B text was recensional. Fee addressed this question in his study of the texts of P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen. Fee asks,

> whether this text-type [the Egyptian text-type found in P^{75} B] is recensional at all. If so there are only two alternatives. Either it was a recension *created* in the second century (= a revised text) or else it was a *culmination of a process* (= Zuntz's "Euthalian" edition), but a process which had very little time to develop... or whether it [historical probability] favors a third - *viz.* that Hort was basically correct, that the Egyptian text-type is a *carefully preserved* tradition (= careful copying) and not a recension at all.[46]

Fee argues for the last alternative. First he demonstrates

---

[42]Calvin L. Porter, "Papyrus Bodmer XV."

[43]Martini, Il problema.

[44]Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen."

[45]Ibid., 28.

[46]Ibid.

that neither the scribe of P^{66} nor Origen reflects the type of text-critical and philological interests necessary to create a recension of the type which Kenyon or Zuntz propose.[47] Second, he gives evidence that P^{75} itself does not display recensional characteristics.[48] Finally, on the basis of "internal evidence of readings," he argues that the ancestor(s) of P^{75} B is not recensional, but a careful preservation of an ancient (read "the original") text of the NT.[49] In Fee's words:

==========

[47]Ibid., 28-31.

[48]Ibid., 32-40.

[49]For Fee's arguments concerning "internal evidence of readings," see ibid., 40-44. With reference to the connection between the "pure line" and the "original text," Fee comments,

> Hort was correct about B on both counts: it preserves 'not only a very ancient text, but a very pure line of very ancient text.' but, of course, by 'very pure line' Hort meant 'with regard to the original text.' (Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," 40 - quoting Westcott and Hort, Introduction, 250-51).

Fee suggests "it only means that Hort was essentially on the right path" (ibid., 44; see above Fee's quote concerning the myth of a recension of the NT text in Alexandria). Fee's final comments in this article express his admiration of Westcott and Hort:

> The point of wonder is not that we still follow Westcott and Hort, but that they, without our discoveries and advances, revealed such remarkable judgments" (ibid., 45).

Fee makes the same claims about the purity of the P^{75} B text in "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations," *Bib* 52 (1971): 357-73 (especially p. 372). In "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt," *NTS* 28 (1982): 358, Fee concludes that Origen's text "belongs to that rather pure line of preservation found some decades earlier in P^{75} and

> ...the concept of a scholarly recension of the NT text in Alexandria either in the fourth century *or* the second century, either as a created or a carefully edited text, is a myth. The leading MSS of the Egyptian text-type (P^{75} B) are not themselves recensional... An analysis of the textual character of P^{75} B *when compared with other MS traditions* indicates that there is little evidence of recensional activity of any kind taking place in this text-type. These MSS seem to represent a "relatively pure" form of preservation of a "relatively pure" line of descent from the original text.[50]

Fee's arguments against the recensional character of the P^{75} B text-type, however, are not completely convincing. First, the fact that neither P^{66} nor Origen could have created a recension does not preclude the possibility that someone else was involved in such philological pursuits, especially in the literary environment of Alexandria. The scribe of P^{66} and Origen were not the only educated people interested in textual matters during the 2nd-3rd centuries. Second, the fact that P^{75} does not exhibit recensional activities says absolutely nothing about whether the ancestor of P^{75} was a recension. Finally, when discussing "internal evidence of readings," Fee makes a number of unsupported claims concerning what constitutes "recensional" scribal habits. He claims that "what is regarded to be recensional *must be consistently so*

==========

a century later in B."

[50]Fee, "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen," 44 (emphasis his).

throughout the NT" (emphasis mine).[51] Furthermore, he assumes that a "scholarly recension" will

> remove Johannine idiosyncrasies, not create them; that it will tend to harmonize passages, not remove or change such wordings; and that it will tend to alleviate difficulties, not engender them.[52]

But these "recensional tendencies" must be demonstrated from actual textual evidence, not merely presupposed. Fee assumes a level of consistency in recensional activity that might not have existed. Even within a recension, the recensional activity is not consistent from book to book or even within a single book.[53] Furthermore, different recensions display different concerns. Why would a scribe(s) involved in making a recension necessarily want to "remove Johannine idiosyncrasies," or for that matter, "tend to harmonize passages?" This is not to say that Fee is wrong in claiming that the ancestor of P^{75} B text is close to the "original" (rather than a recension); but only that his arguments are not conclusive. Further study of the P^{75} B text and its postulated ancestor must be made before reaching such a conclusion.

---

[51]Ibid., 42.

[52]Ibid., 42.

[53]As evidence, notice the incomplete and inconsistent "corrections" made to various manuscripts. Rarely do correctors, who are involved in recensional activity in their corrections, display the type of consistency Fee requires of "scholarly recensions."

Another weakness evident in Fee's reconstruction of the history of the NT text in Alexandria is evident in his classifications of the Alexandrian witnesses. He divides the Alexandrian witnesses into four groups - two levels of "primary" Neutrals (level one consisting of P^{75} B and Origen; level two consisting of P^{66} and C) and two levels of "secondary" Neutrals (level one consisting of L 33 and Cyril; level two consisting of Ψ 579 892 1241 A).[54] Unfortunately, Fee does not elucidate the defining characteristics of either of these two major categories, let alone the sub-levels of these two groups. In Fee's reconstruction, the question remains as to what makes a witness a "primary" or "secondary" Neutral.[55]

==========

[54]See Fee, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril," 370-71. Fee's classifications coincide with those given by Metzger: Fee's Primary Neutral = Metzger's proto-Alexandrian, and Fee's Secondary Neutral = Metzger's Later Alexandrian (see Metzger, Text, 216). Bart Ehrman rightly criticizes Fee's nomenclature pointing out that "the idea of a 'secondary Neutral' witness is bizarre in the extreme!" (Ehrman, Didymus, 265) And, I might add, this says nothing about the oddity of a *second level* secondary Neutral!

[55]Fee appears to base his classifications on some sort of relationship between witnesses. Yet he does not state whether these groups preserve distinctive readings, or exhibit characteristic types of alterations, or display particular levels of agreement between witnesses.

Martini and the Text of Didymus: Two Alexandrian Streams of Transmission

Carlo Martini builds upon Westcott and Hort's reconstruction of the text in Alexandria, but makes a significant alteration.[56] Whereas Westcott and Hort suggest that the "Alexandrian" text developed over a long period of time, Martini proposes that a revision of the "Neutral" text took place at a very early date.[57] Based upon his

---

[56]As most other scholars, Martini rejects Westcott and Hort's idea of a "Neutral" text. He also notes that most of the scholars who followed Westcott and Hort (including Bousset, von Soden, and Streeter) transformed Hort's "Neutral" readings into the "readings of the local text of Alexandria" (Martini, "A Late Alexandrian Text?" 290-91). In this way, textual critics of the first decades of this century "practically identified the 'Neutral' and the 'Alexandrian' text" (ibid., 291).

[57]Martini's study contains several valuable insights. First, he astutely points out that scholars frequently mention a "late Alexandrian text" but rarely describe its characteristic readings or how it came into existence (Martini, "A Late Alexandrian Text?" 286). He also correctly observes that Westcott and Hort would not accept a description of the "late Alexandrian text" as a text-type distinct from the "Alexandrian" text (ibid., 290). According to Martini, they might accept the designation "late Alexandrian" to describe:

> ... an eclectic text of the third or fourth century, which would have accepted, together with the distinctively Alexandrian readings, also a share of Western readings which had obtained a wide popularity in Egypt since the most ancient times. Hort would envisage in a way like this the work of Hesychius... the putting together of variants derived from the existing texts and so repeating their readings, only in a new combination... (ibid., 290)

In contrast to Westcott and Hort, Martini concludes that the "late Alexandrian" text is actually a very early revision, not a "late" one (ibid., 295).

study of the NT citations of Didymus, Martini concludes that two separate streams of transmission existed in Alexandria; one represented by the distinctive readings of P^{75} B and the second "a text different from the P^{75} B text-type" but nearly as old.[58] In Martini's reconstruction, the so-called "late Alexandrian" text is actually a very early text that "represents a slight correction of a previously unrevised text."[59] These two streams of texts, the "pre-recensional" text of P^{75} B and the slightly revised text represented by the "Late Alexandrian" witnesses, existed side-by-side in Alexandria from a very early period.[60]

Ehrman and the Text of Didymus: One Alexandrian Stream - Differing Levels of Purity

Bart Ehrman interprets Didymus' text of the Gospels differently than Martini, and as a result explains the emergence of the "Late-Alexandrian" witnesses in a very different way. Ehrman was faced with the task of explaining how Didymus was most closely aligned to "proto-Alexandrian" witnesses (the result of a quantitative analysis) yet appeared to be "late Alexandrian" in

---

[58]Martini, "A Late Alexandrian Text?" 295.

[59]Ibid.

[60]Ibid., 295-96.

character (the result of a profile analysis).[61] According to Ehrman, Martini's suggestion that two distinct texts existed side-by-side in Alexandria is inaccurate. Instead, Ehrman concludes that "there was one type of text in Alexandria, with Alexandrian witnesses preserving it in varying levels of purity."[62] Ehrman states that a "Late-Alexandrian" text never existed as a distinctive form of text.[63] According to Ehrman's reconstruction,

> The so-called 'Late Alexandrian' witnesses do not represent a distinct type of text deriving from a recension at all; rather they indicate a movement away from the purest line of Alexandrian text by various witnesses at various times.[64]

Ehrman proposes that the designations "proto-/early-" and "late- Alexandrian" be abandoned, and that in place the designations "primary-" and "secondary-Alexandrian" be adopted.[65] The benefit of these designations is that they

---

[61]Ehrman, Didymus, 263-64.

[62]Ibid., 264.

[63]Ibid., 264. Commenting on the origin of Secondary Alexandrian witnesses, Ehrman argues that,

> The early corruptions of the purest Alexandrian tradition do not necessarily derive from a recension, i.e., from an intentional and deliberate production of an edition or revision. They could just as well have resulted from arbitrary improvements of the biblical text at different times by different scribes who were trained in the same classical tradition for which Alexandria was so famous. (ibid., 264, n. 35).

[64]Ibid., 264.

[65]Ibid., 265-266. Ehrman partially adopts the terminology suggested by Fee, but abandons Fee's use of the term

suggest neither temporal priority nor textual superiority or inferiority, but rather point to each particular witness's relative purity.[66]

Ehrman uses his analysis of Didymus' text of the Gospels to corroborate his reconstruction. Didymus could agree most extensively with "Primary Alexandrian" witnesses while being classified as "Secondary Alexandrian" because "his text is on the same level of impurity as other secondary witnesses, but does not always share with them the same contaminants."[67] This leads Ehrman to conclude that the text of the NT in fourth-century Alexandria "was fluid."[68] The relatively pure, unrevised, unedited line of text exerted significant control over the Alexandrian tradition, but textual variation tended to stray from this norm.[69]

==========

"Neutral." Ehrman agrees with Fee that "the P^{75} B type of text does not represent a recension of any kind -- i.e. it cannot be considered an edition or revision of earlier texts" (ibid., 263), and that it "obviously... represents a 'a very ancient line of a very ancient text... But that does not make it 'Neutral,' i.e. 'original'" (ibid., 265).

[66]Ibid., 265-266. Unfortunately, Ehrman does not elucidate what types of readings or level of agreement would make a witness "primary" rather than "secondary" Alexandrian.

[67]Ibid., 266.

[68]Ibid., 266.

[69]Ibid., 267.

Conclusion: Unresolved Issues Concerning the Text in Alexandria

This brief survey of opinions concerning the NT text in Alexandria elicits two major questions that remain unresolved. The first question involves the ancestor(s) of the text found in P^{75} B. Does this text represent a "pure line" of preservation of the "original" text, or a very early Alexandrian recension of the wild, primitive NT text? Unfortunately, since P^{75} pre-dates Athanasius by at least a century, the analysis of Athanasius' text provides little new evidence to answer this question.

Athanasius' text will more likely have significance for the second unresolved question, which focuses on the "Secondary Alexandrian" witnesses. Specifically, the question remains whether the "Secondary Alexandrian" witnesses represent a very early revision of the "pure line" of text that existed side-by-side with that "pure line" in Alexandria, or whether the "Secondary Alexandrians" represent independent corruptions of the pure line that were made at various times. The analysis of Athanasius' text of the Gospels will show that the latter explanation is more likely, and in so doing, help to

clarify the history of the NT text in Alexandria, especially during the 4th century.[70]

---

[70]A third question that remains unanswered is whether there are identifiable trends in the variations made to the Alexandrian text. Put simply, what does it mean to classify a witness as "Secondary" Alexandrian? Are there common, defining characteristics among these witnesses? Beyond their common basis in the "purer" Alexandrian text, what causes their textual affinity? If "Secondary" Alexandrian witnesses do not share the same contaminants, why do they group together in the profile analysis? Although these questions lie beyond the scope of this study, it is my hope that this analysis of Athanasius' Gospel-text will provide additional information that will prove helpful in answering these questions.

CHAPTER 3

A METHOD TO THE MADNESS: COLLECTING, COLLATING, AND ANALYZING PATRISTIC SOURCES

In this chapter, I will discuss some of the general problems encountered when gathering and analyzing the biblical references of early church authors giving special attention to Athanasius. While laying out my own approach to the study of Athanasius' text of the Gospels, I also critique the only other extended study in this area - Gerassimos Zervopoulos' unpublished dissertation, "The Gospels-Text of Athanasius" (Boston University, 1955). Contrasting our approaches highlights some of the advances made in the field of NT text-criticism and the study of patristic evidence since Zervopoulos completed his study.

Problem #1 - Sources for Patristic Evidence

The first problem associated with patristic evidence concerns the sources used for gathering data. The first task that needs to be performed is to determine the authenticity of writings attributed to a particular author. The purpose of this study, to collect and analyze Athanasius' text of the Gospels, would be seriously undermined by the inclusion of works that were written by a

different person in a different place at a different time. Unfortunately, Zervopoulos' study is marred by the fact that he includes works attributed to Athanasius that many scholars consider dubious or spurious. Zervopoulos asserts that:

> All the textual quotations collected for the purpose of this study belong to Athanasius' works which are generally accepted as genuine ones.[1]

The authenticity of several of these writings, however, were questioned even in his day, and many others have been seriously questioned since. Spurious and dubious writings which he used include: *Orationes iii* and *iv contra Arianos*

==========

[1]Zervopoulos, "Gospels-Text," 81. Unfortunately, the list of Athanasius' writings that he claims to use is not thorough (ibid., 45-48). An examination of Zervopoulos' apparatus indicates that he uses the following writings of Athanasius which were not included in his list:

In Illud: Omnia mihi tradita sunt (*PG* 25:208-220); see Mt 11:28 and Jn 1:3

Epistula ad Dracontium (*PG* 25:524-533); see Mt 18:6 and 25:27

Epistula ad Afros (*PG* 26:1029-1048); see Mt 5:48, 15:13; Jn 10:30(2X), 14:9(2X)

Epistula ad Amun (*PG* 26:1169-1179); see Mt 22:29

Epistula ad Marcellinum (*PG* 27:12-45); see Mt 11:29(2X); Lk 1:28, 11:46; Jn 1:3,14a, 7:37

Zervopoulos cites the following authorities as supporting the authenticity of Athanasius' writings that he uses (ibid., 45, n. 1): O. Bardenhewer, Patrology (Breisgau and St. Louis: Freiburg, 1908), 220-225; G. Bardy, Literature Grecque Chretienne (Paris: Librairie Blond and Gay, n.d.), 92-97; G. Kruger, Kritische Bemerkungen (Gottingen, 1905); and W. Bright, Historical Writings of Saint Athanasius (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1881).

(*PG* 26:145-525);[2] *De incarnatione dei Verbi et contra Arianos* (*PG* 26:984-1028);[3] *Expositio fidei* (*PG* 25:200-208);[4] *Sermo maior de fidei* (*PG* 26:1264-1293);[5] *Interpretatio in symbolum* (*PG* 26:1232);[6] *De incarnatione dei Verbi* (*PG* 28:25-29);[7] *De incarnatione contra Apollinarem libri i-ii* (*PG* 26:1093-1165);[8] and *Historia*

---

[2]Charles Kannengiesser has questioned the authenticity of *Oratio iii contra Arianos* in Athanase d'Alexandrie Eveque et Ecrivain: Une Lecture des Traites Contre les Ariens (Paris: Beauchesne, 1983), and in "Three Orations Against the Arians: A Reappraisal," in Studia Patristica, vol. 17, pt. 3, (1982), 981-995. The authenticity of *Oratio iv contra Arianos* is almost universally rejected. J. Quasten states that "the so-called fourth discourse does not continue the three and has no connecting link with them... Moreover, style and phraseology contrast so strikingly that Athanasius cannot be considered its author" (Patrology, 28). Clavis Patrum Graecorum, vol. 2 (Brepols: Turnhout, 1974; hereafter cited as *CPG*) lists this as a "spurious" Athanasian writing (see *CPG*, 42 (#2230)).

[3]*CPG* attributes *De incarnatione et contra Arianos* to Marcellus of Ancyra (*CPG*, 136 (#2806)). Robertson concludes that "Athanasian authorship of this tract is very questionable" ("Prolegomena," lxiv). On the other hand, Quasten states that its "authenticity has been questioned," but goes on to say that "no convincing reasons have been advanced against the Athanasian authorship" (Patrology, 28).

[4]*CPG* attributes this work to Marcellus of Ancyra (*CPG*, 136 (#2804)). Quasten lists it as spurious (Patrology, 30).

[5]*CPG* attributes this work to Marcellus of Ancyra (*CPG*, 135 (#2803)). Quasten lists it as spurious (Patrology, 30).

[6]*CPG* (*CPG*, 43 (#2234)) and Quasten (Patrology, 31) both list this work as spurious.

[7]*CPG* attributes this work to Apollinaris of Laodicaea (*CPG*, 310 (#3665)). Quasten does not mention it.

[8]*CPG* (*CPG*, 42 (#2231)) and Quasten (Patrology, 29) both

Arianorum (*PG* 25:692-796).[9] Works of questionable origin which Zervopoulos used (but did not list) include: *Sermo de Patientia* (*PG* 26:1297-1309);[10] *Sermo in Ramos Palmarum* (*PG* 26:1309-1313);[11] the Benedictine preface to *Historia Arianorum ad Monachos* (*PG* 25:692);[12] *Expositiones in Psalmos* (*PG* 27:60-545);[13] and *De Titulus Psalmorum* (*PG*

==========

list this work as spurious. For a defense of Athanasian authorship, see George Dion Dragas, St. Athanasius: Contra Apollinarem (Athens: Church and Theology, 1985), but his opinion has not been widely accepted.

[9]In private conversation, Charles Kannengiesser argued that this work is not genuinely Athanasian. He attributes it to a secretary of Athanasius. While a secretary is likely to provide the similar textual evidence to Athanasius himself, I did not include this writing because I wanted to restrict my study to Athanasius' use of the text. Whether included or not, the Gospel references from *Historia Arianorum* would not have a significant impact on the textual analysis since they are so few in number.

[10]*CPG* lists this as spurious (*CPG*, 43 (#2235)). For Zervopoulos' use of this as a source, see "Gospels-Text," p. 86 (Mt 5:5) and p. 178 (Mk 13:13).

[11]*CPG* lists this as spurious (*CPG*, 43 (#2236)). For Zervopoulos' use of this as a source, see "Gospels-Text," p. 86 (Mt 5:5).

[12]I find it difficult to understand how Zervopoulos could have mistaken the Benedictine introduction as part of Athanasius' original text. Still, he lists a citation from Mt 19:27 that is found in the Benedictine introduction as an Athanasian citation! (Zervopoulos, "Gospels-Text," 96).

[13]*CPG* includes *Expositiones in Psalmos* in the genuine Athanasian writings (*CPG*, 28 (#2140)). Quasten states that "although some of the items are doubtful, most of them can be regarded as genuine" (Patrology, 38). The authenticity of the *Expositiones*, however, has recently been questioned. Gilles Dorival shows that the *Expositiones* borrows material from Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Apollinaris, Didymus, and Cyril of Alexandria, and concludes that it was written by an unidentified Alexandrian between 440-500 CE (see G.

27:548-1344).[14]

Zervopoulos' uncritical acceptance of all these works as genuinely Athanasian seriously damages the results of his textual study. Zervopoulos lists 276 Athanasian citations from Matthew, 160 of which are from dubious/spurious writings; 24 citations from Mark, 18 from dubious/spurious writings; 75 citations from Luke, 61 from dubious/spurious writings, and 323 citations from John, 169 from dubious/spurious writings. Thus, over 58% of Zervopoulos' data comes from sources whose Athanasian origin is questioned! In order to avoid this problem, I use only those writings that are generally considered to be authentically Athanasian by scholars.[15]

==========

Dorival, "Athanase on Pseudo-Athanase," *RSLR* 16 (1980): 80-89). G.C. Stead compares this work to Athanasius' *Epistula ad Marcellinum* and also concludes that it is post-Athanasian (see G.C. Stead, "St. Athanasius on the Psalms," *VC* 39 (1985): 65-78).

[14]Quasten states, "The treatise *De titulus Psalmorum*... is not by Athanasius but by Hesychius of Jerusalem" (Patrology, 38). He bases his conclusion on the studies of M. Faulhaber, Isaiasglossen des Hesychius (Freiburg: 1900), xvi-xx; and idem, "Eine wertvolle Oxforder Handschrift," *TQ* 83 (1901): 227-232; and G. Mercati, "Note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica," *ST* 5 (Rome, 1901): 145-179; and idem, "Sull' autore del De titulis psalmorum stampato fra le opere de S. Atanasio," *OCP* 10 (1944): 7-22.

[15]In order to determine the consensus of opinion, I depended heavily upon the lists in CPG and the major patrologies. I also surveyed the field to see if any serious objections had been raised concerning authenticity. The one exception where I did not follow scholarly consensus is *Oratio iii contra Arianos*. Most scholars still affirm its authenticity, but I found the evidence

A second task related to patristic sources is the selection of accurate texts of the author's writings. Zervopoulos used Migne's edition of *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca* (= *PG*) as his source for gathering Athanasius' Gospel quotations.[16] Unfortunately Migne's edition is not reliable. In certain instances, scribes corrupted Athanasius' text, especially his biblical references. Whether intentionally or not, scribes often changed the wording of biblical citations to reflect the wording with which they were familiar (most often the Byzantine text-type). These corruptions were carried over into Migne's printed edition.[17] Furthermore, Migne himself

==========

presented by Kannengiesser against Athanasian authorship persuasive (see n. 2 above). For this reason, I did not list the Gospel citations from *Oratio iii contra Arianos* in my text and apparatus, but instead placed them separately in Appendix C. I hope to perform a textual analysis of these Gospel references sometime in the future to see how closely their textual character aligns with the Gospel text in the first two *Orationes*.

[16]J.-P. Migne, ed., Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca Prior, vols. 25-28, (Paris, 1863).

[17]The problems with using Migne's *PG* have been frequently noted. See Ehrman, Didymus, 5-7; and Gordon Fee, "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism: The State of the Question," *ANRW* (1992) II.26.1: 248-249. Based upon his examination of several Greek church fathers for the International Greek New Testament Project of Luke, Fee found that good critical editions would always move the biblical text of the church father away from the Textus Receptus and towards modern critical editions of the NT (see Gordon Fee, "Modern Textual Criticism and the Revival of the *Textus Receptus*, " *JETS* 21 (1978): 26-27).

introduced errors of spelling, omissions, repetitions, and other errors.[18]

Zervopoulos recognized that using Migne's edition might cause problems, but he felt the amount of difference between Migne and the critical editions was insignificant. He observed that "out of around 60 Gospel-quotations I compared between these two editions [i.e. Migne's *PG* and Opitz's Athanasius' Werke], I spotted only 4 variants."[19] Yet even this amount of difference could significantly alter the statistical analysis.

In order to overcome this problem, I used only those Athanasian writings which are available in critical editions for gathering textual data. The use of critical editions helps to filter out later scribal corruptions and provide a text closer to Athanasius' original wording. The following writings of Athanasius are available. The critical edition of H.G Opitz contains:[20] *De decretis*

==========

[18]R. Grant made the following succinct comment about citing patristic evidence:

> Migne should never be used. His own misprints and other errors render his editions less satisfactory than those of the old Benedictine editors whom he usually followed [R. Grant, "The Citation of Patristic Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus," in New Testament Manuscript Studies, ed. Merrill Parvis and Allen Wikgren (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), 120].

[19]Zervopoulos, "Abstract of a Dissertation" (appended to "Gospels-Text".)

[20]H.-G. Opitz, Athanasius Werke 2 (Berlin and Liepzig,

Nicaenae synodi, *De sententia Dionysii*, *Apologia de fuga sua*,[21] *Apologia contra Arianos (= Apologia secunda)*, *Epistula encyclica*, *Epistula ad Serapionem de morte Arii*, *Epistula ad monachos*,[22] and *De synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleuciae in Isauria*. Critical editions are also available for *Oratio Contra Gentes*,[23] *Oratio de incarnatione Verbi*,[24] *Apologia ad Constantium*,[25] *Epistula ad Epictetum*,[26] *Epistulae festales: Fragmenta apud Cosmam Indicopleustam*,[27] *Epistula ad Amun*, *Epistula xxxix*, and *Epistula ad Rufinianum*,[28] and

==========

1935-1941), 1-280. Athanasius' writings are listed in the order they appear in Opitz's critical edition.

[21]In addition to Opitz, Athanasius Werke, 68-86, see the critical edition of *Apologia de fuga sua* edited by Jan M. Szymusiak, Athanase d'Alexandrie: Apologie a l'empereur Constance et Apologie pour sa fuite, SC 56 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1958)

[22]Opitz includes *Historia Arianorum* in this portion of his critical edition, but the authenticity of this writing has been questioned (see above).

[23]Robert W. Thomson, ed. and trans., Athanasius: Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971).

[24]Charles Kannengiesser, Sur l'incarnation du Verbe, SC 199 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1973). See also R.W. Thomson, Athanasius, 134-276.

[25]See Szymusiak, Athanase d'Alexandrie, 88-132.

[26]Georgius Ludwig, ed. Epistula ad Epictetum (Jenae: T.H. Pohle, 1911).

[27]E.O. Winstedt, The Christian Topography of *Cosmas Indicopleustes* (Cambridge, 1909), 295-98; and W. Wolska-Conus, *Cosmas Indicopleustes*: Topographie chretienne 3, SC 197 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1973), 241-53.

[28]P.P. Joannou, *Fonti II*, (Rome: Grottaferrata, 1963), 63-71, 71-76, 76-80.

Epistulae i-ii ad Orsisium and *Narratio Athanasii*.[29] In addition, I have examined Charles Kannengiesser's collations of the leading manuscripts of *Orationes i-ii contra Arianos*.[30] Athanasius' references to the Gospels which are found in these sources are used as the basis of my collations and statistical analysis.[31]

Problem #2 - Identification of Gospel Source

A second problem associated with patristic evidence concerns the identification of the Gospel from which Athanasius cites. Athanasius very seldom identifies his Gospel source by name. Even when he does, we cannot be certain that he has identified it accurately. This problem

---

[29]F. Halkin, *Sancti Pachomii Vitae graece*, Subsidia Hag. 19 (Bruxelles, 1932), 91, 95-96, 119-20.

[30]Prof. Kannengiesser graciously allowed me to examine his collations of the *Orationes i-iv contra Arianos*. I consulted his collations of the third and fourth *Orationes*, but I did not include them in the text or analysis because of their questionable authenticity. On the basis of his collations, I have reconstructed what I believe to have been Athanasius' original wording. These reconstructions do not reflect the opinion of Prof. Kannengiesser whose forthcoming critical edition of the *Orationes* may differ from my reconstructions.

[31]Only a few of Athanasius' major works are not found in critical editions - *Epistulae i-iv ad Serapionem*, *Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae*, and *Vita Antonii*. A number of smaller epistles and writings are also not available (for a complete list, see Appendix B). I have listed the Gospel references from these writings as found in *PG* in Appendix B. These references are not used for collations or textual analysis.

is complicated further by the existence of parallel Gospel passages and harmonizations between Gospels.[32]

Zervopoulos frequently identifies a citation as referring to one Gospel when it might have come from a parallel passage in another Gospel. An example of this problem can be found in his identification of αφεωνται σου αι αμαρτιαι (*De Synodis* 49 = *PG* 26,781). He identifies this clause as referring to Mt 9:5. But Mt 9:5 has parallels not only in Mk 2:9 and Lk 5:23, but also in Mt 9:2 (= Mk 2:5 = Lk 5:20). This citation could have come from any of these six Gospel locations! Numerous other examples exist in Zervopoulos' study.[33] The possibility of

---

[32]For a discussion of this problem see Ehrman, Didymus, 8-11. An example of the problems associated with the incorrect identification of the biblical sources of an early church author's citations can be seen in Geerlings' and New's analysis of Chrysostom's text of Mark (see J. Geerling and S. New, "Chrysostom's Text of the Gospel of Mark," *HTR* 24 (1931): 121-142). Gordon Fee has shown how the results of their study are seriously damaged by their incorrectly identifying Chrysostom's biblical source from the Gospel of Mark when identical parallel passages exist in Matthew and Luke (see Gordon Fee, "The Text of Chrysostom in Mark and John," *NTS* 26 (1979-80): 538-547).

[33]A second example is Zervopoulos' identification of ει υιος ει του θεου (*Oratio ii contra Arianos* 73 = *PG* 26,301) as a citation of Mt 4:3 when it could have just as easily come from Lk 4:3. A third example is his identification of δια μεσου αυτων επορευετο (*Apologia de Fuga Sua* 15 = *PG* 25,664) as referring to Lk 5:30. But in the context of the *Apologia*, this clause appears *within* a citation from Jn 8:58-59. There is no reason to conclude that Athanasius is harmonizing or conflating citations here, especially since this clause appears in several Greek manuscripts of Jn 8:58. A collation of Jn 8:58 reveals that the clause is

misidentifying Gospel sources can adversely affect the outcome of the collations and statistical analysis. In order to avoid this problem, if I could not identify the source of a Gospel reference with a fair degree of certainty (based on internal and contextual evidence), I placed it in a separate appendix (see Appendix A) and did not include it in the statistical analysis.

At other times, Zervopoulos did not recognize harmonizations between Gospel citations. In certain cases, Athanasius harmonized texts from different Gospels to the point that the exact source(s) cannot be determined. In these cases, I again listed the reference in Appendix A. In other cases, however, the source of certain portions of a conflation can be identified. Such is the case for Lk 21:8. While all three Gospels (cf. Mt 24:4-5; Mk 13:5-6) contain some form of βλεπετε μη τις υμας πλανηση πολλοι γαρ ελευσονται επι τω ονοματι μου λεγοντες οτι εγω ειμι, only Mt and Mk contain και πολλους πλανησουσιν,[34] and only Lk

==========

found in several secondary Alexandrian witnesses (C L Ψ 33 579 892 1241 plus the corrector of ℵ). It is not found in any of the primary Alexandrian or the Western witnesses, and it appears in a different form in all the Caesarean and Byzantine witnesses. Thus, Zervopoulos has no reason for identifying this citation as referring to Lk 5:30, except that Migne identifies it as such in a footnote.

[34]According to the IGNTP volume of Luke, this clause is also found in a single manuscript of Luke, the Old Latin ms e, but it is highly improbable that Athanasius follows a lone Western witness. Since this clause could have come

contains the two clauses και ο καιρος ηγγικε and μη πορευθητε οπισω αυτων.[35] Since I was certain that the last two clauses came from Lk 21:8, I collated them with other manuscripts of Luke and the significant variants were used for statistical analysis.[36]

Problem #3 - Presentation of the Author's Biblical Text

A third problem concerns the presentation and classification of patristic data. The following reproduction of Zervopoulos' dissertation shows how he presented his textual data:

The quotations of Athanasius from the Gospel of

4. JOHN

Chapter 1

14. Ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο
(25,449. 26,229. 26,385. 26,513. 26,660. 26,385. 26,388 26,392. 26,433. 26,513. 25,577. 26,64. 26,148. 26,241 26,248. 26,516. 26,1109. 26,1112. 27,16. 27,805. 27,1068. 27,1173. 27,1385)

---

from either Mt or Mk (probably not Lk), it was not included in the statistical analysis. See Chapter 4, Lk 21:8.

[35]According to the critical apparatus of Tischendorf (8th ed), Legg, and von Soden, these clauses are nearly unattested in the manuscript tradition of Mt 24:5 (von Soden lists the addition of both clauses in Mt 24:5 of the Palestinian Syriac lectionary) and unattested in Mk 13:6.

[36]Another conflation exists between Mt 8:29 and Lk 8:28. The first half of this reference, εα τι σοι και υμιν υιε θεου, most likely comes from Mt, and the second half, δεομαι σου μη με βασανισης, from Lk 8:28.

14$^{\beta}$ Και εσκηνωσεν εν ημιν
(26,260. 26,656)

15. Και εθεασαμεθα την δοξαν αυτου δοξαν ως μονογενους παρα του Πατρος πληρης χαριτος και αληθειας
(25,441. 26,777. 26,385)

In this sample, the numbers listed below the biblical passages indicate volume and page number from Migne's *PG* (thus, 25,449 represents volume 25, page 449). A close examination of Zervopoulos' apparatus reveals that his data are plagued with mistakes.[37] In addition, his presentation

==========

[37]In this small sample alone, the following errors occur:
(1) He mistakenly places the text of Jn 1:14 (και εθεασαμεθα... αληθειας) under the heading of Jn 1:15;
(2) He lists incorrect volume and/or page numbers of Migne's *PG*. For example, for Jn 1:14 (ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο) Zervopoulos cites *PG* 25,449 (= *De Decretis* 17-18) as a source, yet no reference is made to Jn 1:14 in either of these chapters of *De Decretis*. Perhaps Zervopoulos meant *PG* 25,441 (= *De Decretis* 15) which has a clear citation of this portion of Jn 1:14 (it is found in a footnote in *PG*). The same is true for Jn 1:15 (sic). He lists *PG* 26,777 (= *De Synodis*) as containing this verse, yet no reference is made to Jn 1:14 in this passage. Perhaps Zervopoulos meant *PG* 26,277 = *Oratio ii contra Arianos* 62 which has a clear citation of this portion of Jn 1:14.
(3) His list of citations often contains needless repetitions. For example, in Jn 1:14 he lists 26,385 and 26,513 twice, but in these texts Athanasius cites Jn 1:14 only once.
(4) His data is woefully incomplete. For example, Zervopoulos lists *De Decretis* 15:2 as containing a citation of Jn 1:14 (ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο), but he fails to mention that this portion of the verse is also cited in *De Decretis* 14:4. He also fails to list four citations of Jn 1:14

of the data is marred by some minor weaknesses that make it difficult for a reader to reconstruct the evidence to check Zervopoulos' conclusions.[38]

In addition to these minor errors and weaknesses, there are three much more significant weaknesses of Zervopoulos' presentation. These seriously affect the analysis of the data. First, he does not indicate how much of the biblical text each of Athanasius' references contains. For example, in Jn 1:15, Zervopoulos lists both *De Decretis* 15 (= *PG* 25,441) and *Oratio ii contra Arianos* 62 (= *PG* 26,277) as containing και εθεασαμεθα την δοξαν αυτου δοξαν ως μονογενους παρα του πατρος πληρης χαριτος και αληθειας. The citation found in *Oratio ii contra Arianos* 62, however, ends with πατρος and does not contain πληρης χαριτος και αληθειας. Zervopoulos never clarifies

---

found in *De Sent. Dion*, one in *De Synodis*, one in *Ep. ad Epictetum*, an additional six in *Oratio I contra Arianos*, and an additional three in *Oratio ii contra Arianos* for a total of fifteen additional citations in these six works alone!

[38]Two of the minor weaknesses in presentation include:
(1) By merely providing volume and page numbers from *PG* rather than also giving the title and chapter number of Athanasius' work, a reader who does not have *PG* readily available cannot check Zervopoulos' accuracy.
(2) There seems to be no organizing principle in Zervopoulos' citations of Athanasius. Most of the time he follows the order found in Migne's four volumes, but in Jn 1:14 and several other places he jumps back and forth both within and between volumes of *PG*. It is unclear whether or not his ordering of material indicates some sort of priority or weighing of the evidence.

the starting or ending points of Athanasius' citations.[39]

Second, Zervopoulos rarely points out when Athanasius cites variant readings of a Gospel passage.[40] Zervopoulos does not include the following examples of variant forms: Jn 6:46 in which Athanasius supports both θεου and πατρος; Jn 10:38 in which he supports both πιστευσατε and πιστευετε; Jn 14:9 in which he supports both εμε εωρακως and εωρακως εμε; and Jn 16:14 in which he supports both ληψεται and λαμβανει.[41]

==========

[39]To be fair to Zervopoulos, on one occasion he does indicate that a citation of Mt 3:11 in *Fragment apud Mattheum* (= *PG* 27,1356) ends with εν πνευματι αγιω whereas a citation in *De Incarnatione et Contra Arianos* (= *PG* 26,1009) ends εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι. He includes these ending points only because they represent variant readings, not because he is trying to show differences in length of the two citations.

[40]Zervopoulos indicates that Athanasius cites variant forms of the following verses: Mt 3:11, 4:11, 5:8, 5:48, 7:15, 8:3, 8:31, 10:23, 11:27b, 11:29, 12:32, 19:4, 19:6, 24:24, 28:19; Lk 11:19; Jn 1:17, 1:18, 4:13. In my analysis of Athanasius' text, I found that only Jn 1:17 was cited in variant forms. Even in this case, the variant is listed in a footnote since it involves two different spellings of "Moses." I eliminated the other examples that Zervopoulos lists for the following reasons: (1) some represent differences between citations and adaptations, in which case I followed the wording of the citation (Mt 10:23, 28:19); (2) some represent differences in citations that have uncertain sources, in which case I listed them in Appendix A (Mt 11:27b = Lk 10:22; Mt 19:6 = Mk 10:9); (3) some represent differences found in works from non-critical editions, in which case I listed them in Appendix B (Mt 4:11, 19:4, 24:24); or (4) some represent differences in citations found in dubious/spurious works, in which case I did not include them at all (Mt 3:11, 5:8, 5:48, 7:15, 8:3, 8:31, 11:29, 12:32; Lk 11:19; Jn 1:18, 4:13).

[41]An additional example can be found in Mt 27:20 for which

Third, Zervopoulos fails to distinguish between those cases where Athanasius carefully preserved the wording of his text from those places where he adapted the biblical passage to fit his context. To put it simply, he fails to make a distinction between citations, adaptations, and allusions. He groups citations and adaptations together and apparently gives them equal weight. He does not include more distant allusions to Gospel passages. In some cases, however, these distant allusions are helpful in establishing the church father's biblical text.[42] This failure to "weigh" the data weakens Zervopoulos' reconstruction of Athanasius' text of the Gospels and subsequently his analysis of that text.

In order to avoid the weaknesses of Zervopoulos' presentation of data, I have listed each Gospel reference in its entirety and have clearly identified its Athanasian source according to title and chapter.[43] A full listing of

==========

Athanasius attests variant spellings of "Barabbas." Again, I place this variant in a footnote.

[42]Gordon Fee points out that in certain instances, allusions will have more "value" than citations or adaptations for reconstructing the author's text [see Fee, "The Text of John in *The Jerusalem Bible*: A Critique of the Use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism," *JBL* 90 (1971): 170].

[43]This is the approach followed by Mees in his work on Clement, Ehrman in his work on Didymus, and Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes in their work on Origen. The same completeness could be achieved by using a critical apparatus such as that used by James Brooks in his study of Gregory of Nyssa

Athanasius' Gospel references clearly shows where his biblical text begins and ends. It also allows the reader to see if Athanasius cites variant forms of the passage. In this way, the reader has all of the textual evidence of Athanasius' text of the Gospels readily available.[44]

In addition to listing Athanasius' Gospel references in full, I also classified each reference using one of the following three categories suggested by Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes: (1) citation = [C], "a verbally exact quotation of the biblical text," (2) adaptation = [Ad], "a quotation that has been somewhat modified (syntactically or materially) in light of the context" of Athanasius' discussion; and (3) allusion = [All], "a clear echo of a passage which nonetheless lacks a sustained verbal agreement" to that passage.[45] I based each classification

---

[James A. Brooks, The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa, SBLNTGF 2 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991)]. Brooks' approach still leaves the task of reconstructing the church father's text to the reader.

[44]By citing Athanasius' Gospel references in full, the reader does not need to consult Athanasius writings (except to check *my* scribal accuracy!) The full text also makes it easier for the reader to judge my textual evaluations and reconstructions.

[45]See Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, Origen, 22. These are the same three categories suggested by Fee in "The Text of John in the Jerusalem Bible," 169-170, and "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria," 362. His earlier definitions differ, however, and are problematic because he bases them on the author's intent. For example, Fee defines a citation as "those places where a Father *is consciously trying* to cite, either from memory or by

on an examination of the context in which Athanasius makes the reference and a comparison of the reference with manuscripts of the NT and other church fathers.[46] Even though classifying an author's biblical references is a highly problematic and subjective enterprise, it is a helpful and necessary tool for weighing the evidence. After classifying each reference, I listed them in order of

==========

copying, the very words of the biblical text" (emphasis mine). The difficulty of trying to establish the intent lying behind a church father's citation techniques are enormous. The "certainty" of the boundaries between Fee's categories quickly evaporates when he subdivides "citations" into "genuine" and "loose." Such distinctions evoke the questions - what is the difference between a "loose citation" and an "adaptation," and how can we tell the difference?

Ehrman avoids the problems of intentionality when defining these same three categories (see Didymus, 12-14 and 31). The fluidity of these categories is again demonstrated by his use of the such terms as "more or less verbally exact" or "greater or lesser modifications" (ibid., 31). He acknowledges the difficulty in classifying some biblical references (for example how to distinguish between "citations... with small variations" and "slight adaptations" (ibid)). He goes on to state that all such classifications are "provisional," but that mistakes in classifications should be rare. He maintains that the few cases where mistakes in classification are made should have little impact on the statistical analysis. The difficulty in differentiating between these categories is also acknowledged by Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, in Origen, 22, n. 5.

[46]Athanasius sometimes provides information that helps in determining how carefully he is citing a passage. Pertinent to this question are the presence or lack of introductory formulas, the identification of the biblical source by book name or author, the length of the biblical reference, and the type of writing in which the reference appears (i.e. letter, history, apology, theological treatise, etc.).

citations first, followed by adaptations, and finally allusions.[47]

Problem #4 - Text-Critical Methodology

A fourth problem associated with patristic evidence concerns the proper method of analyzing the author's text. The major weakness of Zervopoulos' study is his text-critical method. He tabulates Athanasius' textual affinities by collating the quotations with the *Textus Receptus* (= TR). He then lists the Athanasian readings along with their supporting witnesses where they agree against the TR.[48] The inadequacy of this method has been frequently noted, most significantly by E.C. Colwell and E.W. Tune.[49] Simply stated, this method does not consider those instances where Athanasius agrees with the TR but

---

[47]I consider these three classifications to be *modern* designations which have been invented and used by modern text critics in order to weigh the textual evidence provided by early church authors. I doubt that Athanasius (or any other author) made such distinctions in his own mind when citing from scripture.

[48]Zervopoulos used the critical apparatuses of Legg, Tischendorf, and von Soden for his collations of other witnesses (see Zervopoulos, "Gospels-Text," 84). Because of the serious deficiencies in accuracy and completeness of these apparatuses, they cannot be used by themselves for collation purposes. Instead, the actual mss (or facsimiles) must be consulted.

[49]See E.C. Colwell and E.W. Tune, "The Quantitative Relationships between MS Text-Types," in Biblical and Patristic Studies, ed. J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thomson (Freiburg: Herder, 1963), 25-32.

differs from other important textual witnesses. Colwell and Tune concluded that,

> A sound method [of determining MS relationships] requires that in any area of text that is sampled the total amount of variation must be taken into account - not just the variants from some text used as a 'norm'.[50]

Other improvements in determining textual relationships have been made by Colwell,[51] Gordon Fee,[52] Frederik Wisse[53]

---

[50]Ibid., 25. The working assumption behind this statement is that the total number of variation-units that exists in a portion of text is always larger than the number of variant readings that exists between any two witnesses.

[51]See the collection of articles by E.C. Colwell in Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament, NTTS 9 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969). One of Colwell's most important advancements in analyzing a text is the quantitative analysis, which calculates percentages of agreements between textual witnesses over all significant units of variation (see Chapter 5).

[52]Fee makes several helpful suggestions for gathering, weighing, and analyzing patristic evidence. See Gordon Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships," *NTS* 15 (1968-69): 23-44; and "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations," *Bib* 52 (1971): 357-373.

[53]Wisse and McReynolds were key figures in developing the Claremont Profile method. Unlike Wisse and McReynolds, however, I still recognize the importance of performing a complete quantitative analysis in addition to a profile analysis. Wisse and McReynolds developed the Claremont Profile as a quick method of classifying mss, not a thorough analysis. Wisse seems to indicate that if a profile analysis is performed, then a quantitative analysis is not needed. See Frederik Wisse, The Profile Method for Classifying and Evaluating Manuscript Evidence, SD 44 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

and Paul McReynolds,[54] and Bart Ehrman.[55] None of these advancements in determining textual relationships was used by Zervopoulos - or even available to him. I will use the quantitative analysis (as developed by Colwell and Tune) and the Comprehensive Group Profile analysis (as developed by Ehrman) to analyze Athanasius' text of the Gospels. These methodological developments make the final analysis of the text more accurate and certain.

---

[54]Paul McReynolds, "The Claremont Profile Method and the Grouping of Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts," (Ph.D. dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1969).

[55]Ehrman's study of Didymus' text of the Gospels is pivotal for my own study. I follow several of the techniques he developed in that study, especially the use of his Comprehensive Group Profile (see Ehrman, Didymus, 223-28, 257-58). For additional discussion on method of analyzing textual evidence, see Bart Ehrman, "Methodological Developments in the Analysis and Classification of NT Documentary Evidence," *NovT* 29 (1987): 22-45; and "The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence," *JBL* 106 (1987): 465-486.

CHAPTER 4

THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS OF ATHANASIUS AND THE CRITICAL APPARATUS

The Text[1]

This chapter contains the complete text of the Gospels cited by Athanasius in his writings that are available in critical editions.[2] His references to the Gospels are listed according to biblical book under chapter and verse number.[3] Each of the Gospel references is classified according to the following three categories: (1) citation = [C], (2) adaptation = [Ad], or (3) allusion = [All].[4] Citations are listed first, followed by adaptations, and

---

[1]The text and critical apparatus which follows owes much to the contributions made by Ehrman in his work on Didymus' text of the Gospels and by Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes in their work on Origen's text of the Fourth Gospel. This introduction and the following textual apparatus follow closely the procedures outlined in those works (see Ehrman, Didymus, 30-37; and Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes, Origen, 21-37).

[2]In Appendix B, I have listed all of Athanasius' Gospel references that are available in non-critical editions of his writings. This material is neither collated nor included in the statistical analysis due to its questionable textual character (see Chapter 3).

[3]In some cases the Gospel text from which Athanasius is citing cannot be determined with certainty (due to repeated passages within the same Gospel or parallel passages in other Gospels). Indeterminable Gospel references are listed in Appendix A.

[4]For definitions of these categories, see Chapter 3.

finally allusions. Within each of these categories, references are listed in order of the portion of the passage they attest. I list multiple Gospel references in the following order: *Oratio contra gentes*, *Oratio de incarnatione Verbi*, the order of Athanasius' works as found in Opitz's critical edition,[5] followed by *Apologia ad Constantium*, *Apologia de fuga sua*, the various *Epistulae*, and finally *Orationes i-ii contra Arianos*. The chapter and verse divisions of Athanasius' references are those used in the various critical texts of his works. For *Orationes i-ii contra Arianos*, Migne's numbering is used.

Within the Gospel references, I sometimes place a portion of text in parentheses (). This indicates a portion of Athanasius' writing which does not directly relate to the Gospel verse being cited, but does provide important material that identifies its biblical reference or provides a context for the reference.

At times a reference will include two or more consecutive verses. An uninterrupted citation is indicated by placing a plus symbol (+) at the end of the verse and also at the beginning of following verse (e.g. see Jn 6:38-40 in *Oratio ii contra Arianos* 54).

---

[5]For the order of Athanasius' writings in Opitz's critical edition, see Chapter 3.

Athanasius sometimes cites a passage in more than one form. In cases where a single citation exists along with one or more adaptations and/or allusions, the citation is used as the basis of collation. In cases where multiple citations exist which agree exactly in wording, the longest citation (or the first citation if they are all of equal length) is used for collating. A citation marked with a double asterisk, [C]**, indicates that I have used it as a basis for collations. A single asterisk (*) is used to indicate adaptations or allusions which provide evidence for a significant variant reading. In some cases, multiple citations differ to the extent that it became necessary to reconstruct Athanasius' text. In such cases, I provide what I perceive to be his original text, indicating it with the heading "TEXT".[6]

The Critical Apparatus

The Gospel references in Athanasius' writings are separated from the critical apparatus by a solid line. The first entry in the apparatus is a listing of the textual witnesses that are lacunose (= Lac.), i.e. missing all or a

---

[6]At times, it is impossible to resolve which of two variant readings represent Athanasius' text. In such cases, I place both variant readings within brackets under the heading "TEXT" and indicate Athanasius support for both readings by the symbol Ath^{pt} in the critical apparatus.

portion of that verse. Witnesses which are fragmentary or include only a portion of the verse are placed in parentheses. For witnesses that contained only a portion of the verse, the symbol "inc." (*incipit* = beginning with) followed by a Greek word is used to indicate where that witness begins, and the symbol "expl." (*explicit* = ending with) followed by a Greek word is used to show where that witness ends.

Following the list of lacunose witnesses, variant readings attested by two or more witnesses are listed. The reading which agrees with Athanasius' reading always appears left of the bracket ( ]). All other readings (whether singly or multiply attested) are placed to the right of the bracket. The symbol "rell." (*reliqui* = all the rest) is used to simplify the apparatus. It indicates all the witnesses that are not explicitly listed either as lacunose or supporting a different reading. Witnesses which vary slightly from a particular variant reading, but still provide substantial support, are placed in parentheses (). For some variants, certain witnesses (especially the Old Latin mss, cf. below) do not support one reading over another. These witnesses are listed within brackets following the designation "NA:" - meaning "not applicable." Witnesses which are partially lacunose for the verse and are missing the portion of the verse

related to that particular variant are placed in brackets following "Lac." The witnesses are listed in the following order: papyri, uncials, minuscules, versions, modern editions of the Greek texts, and other church fathers. A superscript asterisk (*) was used to indicate the "first hand" (i.e. original) reading of a particular witness. A superscript letter "C" (^{c}) was used to indicate a corrected reading of that witness.[7]

Following the significant variant readings and separated by a broken line, the singular variant readings are listed. These are readings which are attested by only a single witness. As such, they cannot be used to calculate textual affinity between witnesses.

A special note must be made concerning the use of the Old Latin witnesses (hereafter, OL). In many cases, the OL cannot be used to support one reading over another (e.g. the presence or lack of the article, certain pronouns, certain verb tenses and moods, some cases of word order, etc.). In those cases, the OL are listed as "NA:"

---

[7]For witnesses that have multiple "correctors," (e.g. ℵ and B), no attempt was made to identify between the various correctors.

The Textual Witnesses

The textual witnesses which are used for collations and cited in the critical apparatus are given on the following page. These represent the leading witnesses of the various textual families. The textual groupings are those commonly accepted among text critics.[8] Some witnesses that contain mixed texts or whose textual alignments are uncertain have been collated because their texts contain significant readings. These witnesses are included in the quantitative analysis, but are not used in the profile analysis to determine group alignments.[9] The texts of three Alexandrian church fathers, Clement and Didymus in all four Gospels, and Origen in the Fourth Gospel only, are also collated and used in the quantitative analysis. Their testimony is valuable in tracing the transmission of the New Testament text in Alexandria from the second through the fourth centuries. Two "modern"

---

[8]See Metzger, Text, pp. 36-92, 211-219, 247-256.

[9]The inclusion of "mixed" and "uncertain" witnesses does not negatively affect the quantitative analysis. The purpose of the quantitative analysis is to determine percentages of agreement between each textual witness and every other witness. A full quantitative analysis is necessary in order to determine such things as block mixture within witnesses. These "mixed" and "uncertain" witnesses are used because they contain important evidence concerning both the original text and the history of the text.

Greek editions, the TR and UBS[4], are also included in the textual apparatus.[10]

---

[10]While UBS[4] and the TR are not technically "Alexandrian" or "Byzantine" witnesses, their texts exhibit close textual affinities to other witnesses of each of those text-types (respectively). Furthermore, both of these editions are readily available to textual scholars. The TR is the basis of numerous other collations (including the IGNTP), and the UBS[4] text (which is equivalent in wording to NA[27]) is the "standard" critical edition used among biblical scholars.

Textual Witnesses Used for Collations and Cited in the Critical Apparatus

Matthew

Primary Alexandrian:	ℵ B UBS^4
Secondary Alexandrian:	C L 33 892
Western:	D a b e k
Caesarean:	Θ f^1 f^{13}
Byzantine:	A E Δ Π Ω TR
Church Fathers:	Clem Did
Mixed or Uncertain Text:	W 565 700 1241

Mark

Primary Alexandrian:	ℵ B UBS^4
Secondary Alexandrian:	C L Δ Ψ 33 579 892
Western:	D a b e k
Caesarean:	Θ f^1 f^{13}
Byzantine:	A E Π Ω TR
Church Fathers:	Clem Did
Mixed or Uncertain Text:	W 565 700 1071 1241

Luke

Primary Alexandrian:	P^{75} ℵ B UBS^4
Secondary Alexandrian:	C L Ψ 33 579 892
Western:	D a b e
Caesarean:	Θ f^1 f^{13}
Byzantine:	A E Δ Π Ω TR
Church Fathers:	Clem Did
Mixed or Uncertain Text:	W 565 700 1071 1241

John

Primary Alexandrian:	P^{66} P^{75} ℵ (8:39-21:25) B UBS^4
Secondary Alexandrian:	C L W Ψ 33 579 892
Western:	ℵ (1:1-8:38) D a b e
Caesarean:	P^{45} Θ f^1 f^{13}
Byzantine:	A E Δ Π Ω TR
Church Fathers:	Clem Orig Did
Mixed or Uncertain Text:	W 565 700 1241

Abbreviations and Siglа

[Ad]	Adaptation
[Ad]*	Adaptation that supports a reading of one or more of the significant variants listed in the apparatus
[All]	Allusion
[All]*	Allusion that supports a reading of one or more of the significant variants listed in the apparatus
[C]	Citation
[C]**	Citation used as the basis for collations
^{c}	a superscript letter "c" (^{c}) indicates the reading of a corrector of the manuscript
expl.	*explicit* - indicates the final Greek word in a partially lacunose witness
inc.	*incipit* - indicates the initial Greek word in a partially lacunose witness
Lac.	*lacunose* - text is missing for all or a portion of a verse
NA	Not Applicable - indicates that a witness cannot give support of any of the variant readings
TEXT	indicates the reconstructed text used as the basis for collations
^{vid}	*videtur* - indicates the likely reading of a witness that is fragmentary or lacunose
*	a superscript asterisk (*) indicates the reading of the original hand of a manuscript
+	at the end of a citation indicates that the citation is continued without break in the following verse; at the beginning of a citation indicates that it is an uninterrupted continuation of a citation from the previous verse

[]	brackets within a reconstructed text (designated by TEXT) indicate variant readings which Athanasius supports
--------	variants listed above this line are significant and used for textual analysis; variants listed below this line are singular and are not included in the textual analysis
...	indicates the inclusion of all the words in between the words listed
()	Depending upon their location, parentheses indicate the following: (1) parentheses found in Athanasius' text indicate portions of his text which are not verbally connected to the biblical verse, but which provide important contextual information (2) parentheses in the lacunose (Lac.) line indicate that the witness is only partially lacunose (these are then explicitly listed as lacunose for every unit of variation for which they do not have text) (3) parentheses used in the critical apparatus indicate witnesses that give only partial, but substantial, support of that particular reading; or indicate witnesses which support two (or more) possible readings, but not any others (this is especially the case for the OL witnesses)

MATTHEW

Matt. 1:23 (cf. Isaiah 7:14)

ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός (*De Inc.* 33:14-16) [C][11]

Ἐμμανουὴλ, ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 10) [C][12]

ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱὸν, καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουὴλ, ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 54) [C][13]

λέγεται μόνος ὁ ἐκ Μαρίας Ἐμμανουήλ... τὸ γὰρ Ἐμμανουὴλ ἑρμηνεύεται μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 11) [Ad]

ἡ δὲ παρθένος ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων ἐν γαστρὶ ἔσχε καὶ γέγονεν ὁ κύριος ἄνθρωπος (*De Sent. Dion* 9:3) [All]

==========

[11]Even though this quotation is introduced by the statement, "For the prophets previously foretold the miracle of the Virgin and the birth from her, saying..." it appears to derive from Mt 1:23 instead of Is 7:14. The clause ο εστι μεθερμηνευομενον μεθ᾽ ημων ο θεος does not appear in the LXX.

This citation and the citation from *Ep. ad Epictetum* 10 provide evidence for the following singular variant, but it is most likely the result of itacism:

εξει rell] εξη L [NA: a b k]

This and all the following references also attest the following variant concerning the spelling of "Emmanuel:"

Ἐμμανουηλ ℵ^{c} rell] Ἐμανουηλ ℵ* ; Ἐνμανουηλ D ; *Emmanuet* k

[12]Since Mary's name is mentioned in the preceding context, this citation's source is Mt 1:23 rather than Is 7:14.

[13]This citation is introduced by the statement, "And to miss the person was the lot of the Jews, and is still, who think that of one of themselves is said..." This introduction makes it appear that the source of the citation is Is 7:14, yet it is more likely taken from Mt 1:23 because it contains the clause ο εστι μεθερμηνευομενον μεθ᾽ ημων ο θεος (see previous footnotes).

Lac. A Θ e Clem (Did)

εν γαστρι rell] εγγαστρι f^{13} [NA: a b k]

καλεσουσι rell] καλεσεις D [Lac. Did]

αυτου $\aleph^c$ rell] omit $\aleph^*$ [Lac. Did]

Matt. 2:13

ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπτον· μέλλει γὰρ Ἡρώδης ζητεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου (*Apol. Fuga* 12:8-9) [Ad]*[14]

Lac. A Θ e Clem Did

το παιδιον rell] τον παιδιον Δ ; τον παιδα D [NA: a b k]

γαρ rell] add o L [NA: a b k]

Matt. 2:19

καὶ ἀποθανόντος δὲ Ἡρώδου (*Apol. Fuga* 12:11) [All]

Lac. A Θ e Clem Did

Matt. 2:22

φαίνεται δι᾽ Ἀρχέλαον τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ (*Apol. Fuga* 12:11-12) [All][15]

==========

[14]This adapation attests the following variant concerning the spelling of "Egypt:"

Αιγυπτον rell] Αιγυπον L

[15]This allusion attests the following variant concerning the spelling of "Archelaus:"

Αρχελαος rell] Αρχιλαος D ; Αρχαιλαος L Δ

Lac. A Θ e Clem Did

Matt. 2:22b-23a

ἀναχωρῶν εἰς τὴν Ναζαρέτ (*Apol. Fuga* 12:12) [All][16]

Lac. A Θ e Clem Did

Matt. 4:10

ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 69) [C][17]

Lac. A Θ Π e Clem Did

οπισω μου C^{c} D E L Ω 33 892^{c} 1241 b] οπισω a ; omit ℵ B C^{*vid} W Δ f^{1} f^{13} 565 700 892^{*vid} k TR UBS^{4}

Matt. 5:8

μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται (*CG* 2:34-35) [C]

μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 64) [C]

Lac. A L e

θεον rell] κυριον k

==========

[16]This allusion attests the following variant concerning the spelling of "Nazareth:"

Ναζαρετ rell] Ναζαρεθ C E W (Δ) Π Ω (f^{1}) f^{13} 565 a b ; *Nazarein* k

[17]This citation comes from Mt 4:10 rather than Mt 16:23 (or its parallel in Mk 8:33) because the context speaks of "the serpent" (τον οφιον) being assailed by the Savior. In Mt 16:23/Mk 8:33, Jesus rebukes Peter.

Matt. 5:10

μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης (*Apol. Fuga* 19:9-10) [C]

Lac. A L e Did

ενεκεν rell] ενεκα B

ενεκεν rell] add της C

Matt. 5:36

καὶ ὅτι ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς οὐδὲ θρὶξ ἀνθρώπου δύναται λευκὴ ἢ μέλαινα γενέσθαι (*Apol. Fuga* 15:34-36) [All]

Lac. A C e Did

Matt. 6:6

σὺ δέ, ὅταν προσεύχῃ, εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ ταμιεῖόν σου, καὶ ἀπόκλεισον τὰς θύρας (*Apol. Const.* 17:4-5) [Ad]*

Lac. A C e Clem Did

συ... προσευχη rell] υμεις... προσκευνητε k

εισελθε rell] εισελθων Δ

Matt. 6:7

ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ οἱ ἐθνικοι (ὡς εἶπεν ὁ κύριος) βαττολογοῦντες ἐν ταῖς εὐχαῖς οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦσιν (*De Synodis* 32:3) [All]*[18]

==========

[18]This allusion attests the following variation in spelling. Athanasius' allusion is too loose to provide certain textual evidence, so it is not included in the

---

Lac. A C (33) e Clem Did

εθνικοι rell] υποκριται B [Lac. 33]

Matt. 6:25

μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσησθε. οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖόν ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος; + (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 25) [C]

Lac. A C D e (Clem)[expl. ενδυσησθε] Did

φαγητε ℵ f^{1} 892 a b k Clem] add η τι πιητε B W f^{13} 33 UBS^{4} ; add και τι πιητε rell

υμων^{2} ℵ^{c} Clem rell] omit ℵ* b k

μεριμνατε rell] μεριμνησατε f^{13} [NA: a b k]

μηδε rell] η k

σωμα rell] add πλειον εστι b

Matt. 6:26

+ ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τά πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὅτι οὐ σπείρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν εἰς τὰς ἀποθήκας· καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τρέφει αὐτά· οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν; + (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 25) [C]

Lac. A C D e Clem Did

εις τας αποθηκας rell] εν ταις αποθηκαις a b

τας ℵ^{c} L] omit ℵ* rell [NA: a b k]

==========

statistical analysis.

βαττολογησητε rell] βατολογησητε (E) ; βαττολογειτε 700$_{4}$; βατταλογειται W ; βατταλογησητε ℵ B f^{13} UBS^{4} ; βλαττολογησητε D [Lac. 33]

ουχ rell] ουχι W Θ [NA: a b k]

ουδε[1] rell] ουτε 1241 [NA: a b k]

ουδε[2] rell] ουτε 1241 [NA: a b k]

υμων rell] omit 892[*] ; ημων L

ουχ rell] add ουν k

μαλλον διαφερετε αυτων rell] *plurimum discatis ab eis* k

αυτων rell] τουτων E

Matt. 6:27

+ τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν ἕνα; + (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 25) [C]

Lac. A C D e Clem Did

μεριμνων rell] omit a b k

εξ υμων (b k) rell] υμων Δ (b k) ; omit a

Matt. 6:28

+ καὶ περὶ ἐνδύματος τί μεριμνᾶτε; καταμάθετε τὰ κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ πῶς αὐξάνουσιν· οὐ κοπιῶσιν οὐδὲ νήθουσι. + (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 25) [C]

Lac. A C D e Clem Did

τι rell] omit a b k

αυξανουσιν (ℵ[*vid] = ου ξαινουσιν) ℵ[c] B Θ f[1] 33 UBS[4] a b k] αυξανει rell

κοπιωσιν/κοπια ουδε νηθουσι ℵ[c] rell] νηθουσιν ουδε κοπιωσιν ℵ[*vid] Θ

κοπιωσιν ℵ (B) Θ f[1] (33) a b k UBS[4]] κοπια rell

νηθουσι ℵ B Θ f[1] 33 a b k UBS[4]] νηθει rell

και rell] omit k

ου ℵ^{c} rell] ουδε ℵ*

Matt. 6:29

+ λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδὲ Σολομὼν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιεβάλετο ὡς ἓν τούτων. + (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 25) [C]

Lac. A C D e Clem Did

οτι rell] omit W

ουδε rell] ουτε Θ [NA: a b k]

αυτου rell] omit 1241

περιεβαλετο rell] περιβεβλητε L

Matt. 6:30

+ εἰ δὲ τὸν χόρτον τοῦ ἀγροῦ σήμερον ὄντα καὶ αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον ὁ θεὸς οὕτως ἀμφιέννυσιν, οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι; (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 25) [C]

Lac. A C D e Clem Did

ου πολλω rell] ουπω L ; ποσω Δ a b k

ει δε rell] ιδε ℵ ; οτι ει a(= *quod si*) ; ει γαρ b(= *si enim*) ; ει ουν k(= *si ergo*)

σημερον rell] add εν αγρω W

υμας rell] ημας k

Matt. 7:6

μὴ δῶτε τὰ ἅγια τοῖς κυσὶ μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων (*Apol. Contra Arianos* 11:2 - taken from a *Circular Letter of Egyptian Bishops* [338/339 CE]) [C][19]

μὴ δότε γὰρ τὰ ἅγια τοῖς κυσὶ (φησὶν ὁ κύριος) μηδὲ ῥίπτητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων (*Quaestio cxii ad Antiochum ducem in collectione canonum*) [Ad]*

Lac. A D e

τα αγια Did^{pt}] το αγιον Did^{pt} rell

βαλητε (E) rell] βαλλετε L ; βαλετε 1241 [NA: a b k Clem]

μαργαριτας Ath^{pt} Clem Did^{pt}] add υμων Ath^{pt} Did^{pt} rell

Matt. 8:29 (cf. Lk 8:28, Mk 5:7)

ἔα τί σοι καὶ ἡμῖν υἱε θεοῦ; (δέομαί σου, μή με βασανίσῃς) (*De Inc.* 32:22-23) [Ad]*[20]

Lac. A D 1241 e Clem Did

==========

[19]This citation and the following adaptation support two variant readings that can be attributed to itacism.

δωτε Ath^{pt} rell] δοτε Ath^{pt} f^{1} f^{13} 1241 [NA: a b k; Lac. Clem]

[20]This adaptation represents a conflation of Mt 8:29 and Lk 8:28 (see footnote at Lk 8:28). Mt is the only Gospel that uses the plural ημιν rather than the singular εμοι (as found in Mk 5:7 amd Lk 8:28). Other possible sources for the first half of the citation are Mk 1:24 = Lk 4:34 (which contain the plural ημιν), but these are unlikely as sources since both contain Ἰησου Ναζαρηνε instead of υιε θεου.

This adaptation gives evidence concerning the following variant. It was not included in the statistical analysis because it probably is the result of itacism.

σοι rell] συ L f^{13}

υιε θεου ℵ B C* L f^1 33 892 k UBS[4]] Ἰησου υιε θεου C^c rell

---

ημιν rell] υμιν 700

Matt. 9:36 (cf. Mk 6:34)

ὡς πρόβατα ἐρριμμένα καὶ ἐσκυλμένα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα (*Apol. Contra Arianos* 57:3 - taken from *The Letter of the Bishops of Palestine to the Egyptian Church* (346 CE)) [All]*[21]

Lac. A 1241 e Clem Did

ως C D L Θ f^1 33 565] ωσει rell [NA: a b k]

εσκυλμενοι rell] εκλελυμενοι L TR

και ερριμμενοι] omit 33

ερριμμενοι rell] ρεριμμενοι D* [NA: a b k]

Matt. 10:18 (= Mk 13:9; Lk 21:12)

ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας καὶ βασιλέας ἤχθησαν (*Hist. Arianorum* 31:4) [All]*[22]

Lac. A 1241 e Clem Did

επι ηγεμονας και βασιλεις rell] επι βασιλεις και ηγεμονας a b k [NA: D - see omission below)

αχθησεσθε rell] σταθησεσθε D a b k

==========

[21]This is an allusion to Mt 9:36 because Mk 6:34 lacks the adjectives ερριμμενα και εσκυλμενα.

[22]This is an allusion to Mt 10:18 rather than Mk 13:9 or Lk 21:12 because it contains the verb ηχθησαν instead of Mark's σταθησεσθε or Luke's απαγομενους.

ηγεμονας rell] ηγεμονων D

και βασιλεις rell] omit D

Matt. 10:22

ὁ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται (*Apol. Contra Arianos* 38:4 - taken from the *Letter of the Council of Sardica to the Church of Alexandria* [343 CE]) [C]

Lac. A 1241 e Clem Did

---

outos rell] omit W

Matt. 10:23

ὅταν δὲ διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν (*Apol. Fuga* 11:17-18) [C]

ἐὰν ὑμᾶς διώκωσιν εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν (*Ep. Encyclica* 5:2) [Ad]*[23]

διωκομένους μὲν ἡμᾶς φεύγειν (*Apol. Const.* 32:28-29) [All]

τὸ δὲ φεύγειν (*Apol. Const.* 32:33) [All]

καὶ τὸ μὲν φεύγειν γέγραπται (*Apol. Fuga* 8) [All]

Lac. A 1241 e Did

διωκωσιν rell] διωκουσιν D Δ Θ f^{13} [NA: a b k]

ετεραν ℵ B W f^{1} f^{13} 33 892 UBS^{4}] αλλην rell [NA: a b k]

την rell] omit f^{13} [NA: a b k]

==========

[23]The phrase εις τηνδε την πολιν in this adaptation could be a conflation with James 4:13.

Matt. 10:29

οὐχι δύο στρουθία ἀσσαρίου πωλεῖται; καὶ ἕν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἀνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 25) [C]

μηδὲ στρουθίον ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἐμπεσεῖν εἰς παγίδα δύναται (*Apol. Fuga* 9:8-10) [Ad]*

καὶ ὅτι ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (οὐδὲ θριξ ἀνθρώπου δύναται λευκὴ ἢ μέλαινα γενέσθαι οὐδὲ) στρουθίον εἰς παγίδα ἐμπεσεῖν ποτε (*Apol. Fuga* 15:34-36) [All]*

Lac. A 1241 e Clem

πωλειται rell] πωλουνται D a b k

ανευ rell] add της βουλης a b

του εν τοις ουρανοις 892 b Did] omit rell

στρουθια rell] add του D [NA: a b k]

επι την γην rell] omit L [Lac. Did]

Matt. 10:40

ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 78) [C]

ὁ δεχόμενός με δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 78) [C]

Lac. A (D) 1241 e (Clem) (Did)

Matt. 11:27 (cf. Lk 10:22)

οὐδεὶς οἶδε τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ (*De Decr.* 12:2) [Ad]*[24]

==========

[24]This adaptation is taken from Mt 11:27 rather than Lk 10:22 because it contains τον υιον instead of the Lucan τις

Lac. A 1241 e Did

αν D 33 Clem] εαν rell [NA: a b k]

ο υιος αποκαλυψη Clem] βουληται ο υιος αποκαλυψαι rell ; βουλεται ο υιος αποκαλυψαι L W ; βουληθη ο υιος αποκαλυψαι 33

Matt. 11:28

δεῦτε πρὸς μὲ, πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 62) [C]

Lac. A 1241 e

πεφορτισμενοι rell] add εστε D a b k

Matt. 12:14

οἱ μὲν φαρισαῖοι ἐξελθόντες συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν + (*Apol. Fuga* 12:14-15) [C][25]

Lac. A 1241 e Clem Did

==========

εστιν ο υιος, and because it contains ουδε τον πατερα τις επιγινωσκει instead of the Lucan και τις εστιν ο πατηρ. It seems doubtful that Athanasius' text contained the verb οιδε. Based upon the four other possible adaptations of this verse (see Appendix A for Mt 11:27), it is more likely that the verb in his text was either γινωσκει or επιγινωσκει.

This adaptation also provides evidence for the following variant, which is most likely attributable to itacism.

ω rell] ο L Θ Ω 892 [NA: a b k]

[25]This citation is taken from Mt 12:14 instead of its parallel in Mk 3:6 because it lacks the Marcan ευθυς μετα των Ἡρῳδιανῶν after φαρισαῖοι, it uses ελαβον in place of the Marcan εδιδουν, and the reference which immediately follows clearly comes from Mt 12:15 instead of Mk 3:7.

οι δε φαρισαιοι εξελθοντες συμβουλιον ελαβον κατ᾽ αυτου (L) Θ f^{13}] εξελθοντες δε οι φαρισαιοι συμβουλιον ελαβον κατ᾽ αυτου ℵ B C f^{1} 33 892 UBS^{4} ; και εξελθοντες οι φαρισαιοι συμβουλιον ελαβον κατ᾽ αυτου D (a) (b) k ; οι δε φαρισαιοι συμβουλιον ελαβον κατ᾽ αυτου εξελθοντες E Π Ω 565 700 TR ; οι δε φαρισαιοι συμβουλιον ελαβον κατ᾽ αυτου W Δ

ελαβον rell] εποιησαν L a b

Matt. 12:15

+ ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς γνοὺς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν (*Apol. Fuga* 12:15-16) [C]

Lac. A 1241 e Clem Did

Matt. 12:24 (= Mk 3:22; Lk 11:15)

τῶν γὰρ Ἰουδαίων λεγόντων, ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὸν τὰ δαιμόνια (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50) [All]*[26]

Lac. A 1241 e Clem

εν E 33] add τω rell [NA: a b k]

εκβαλλει rell] εβαλλει Δ

Matt. 12:28 (cf. Lk 11:20)

εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50) [C][27]

==========

[26]This is most likely an allusion to Mt 12:24 rather than Mk 3:22 or Lk 11:15 because it is followed immediately by a citation from Mt 12:28.

This allusion attests the following variant of the spelling of "Beelzebul:"

Βεελζεβουλ rell] Βεεζεβουλ ℵ B Did ; Βελζεβουλ L b k

[27]This citation and the following one come from Mt 12:28 rather than Lk 11:20 because they contain πνευματι (instead of the Lucan δακτυλω).

εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50) [C]

Lac. A 1241 e Clem Did

εγω εν πνευματι θεου k^c TR] εν πνευματι θεου b k^* ; εν πνευματι θεου εγω rell ; εγω εν πνευματι θεου εγω f^1 [NA: 33 - see omission below]

ει... δαιμονια rell] omit οι υιοι (v. 27)... τα δαιμονια (v. 28) 33

Matt. 12:33 (cf. Mt 7:20; Lk 6:44)

ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ καὶ τὸ δένδρον ἐπιγινώσκεται (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 35) [All]*[28]

Lac. A 1241 e Clem (Did)

επιγινωσκεται Ω^{vid}] γινωσκεται rell [NA: a b k; Lac. Did]

Matt. 12:36

ἕκαστος γὰρ ἡμῶν ἀποδώσει λόγον ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως περὶ ὧν ἐνταῦθα ἔπραξε (*Apol. Contra Arianos* 35:7 - taken from the *Letter of Julius to the Eusebian Bishops* [340 CE]) [All]*

Lac. A 1241 Clem Did

==========

[28]This allusion is closest in wording to Mt 12:33 (the wording in Lk 6:44 is very different). In two places it differs from Mt 7:20: (1) it contains εκ γαρ (= Mt 12:33) instead of αρα γε απο (= Mt 7:20), and (2) it contains του καρπου το δενδρον (= Mt 12:33) instead of των καρπων αυτων (= Mt 7:20). On the other hand, it contains επιγινωσκεται (cf. Mt 7:20 - επιγνωσεσθε) instead of γινωσκεται (Mt 12:33).

αποδωσουσιν (W) rell] δωσουσι 892

Matt. 13:13

καὶ βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσι (*CG* 23:45) [Ad]*[29]

Lac. A Did

ου βλεπουσιν rell] μη βλεπωσιν D Θ f^{1} f^{13} a b e k

Matt. 13:25

ὅτε δὲ ἐχθρός ἄνθρωπος κοιμωμένων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπέσπειρε (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 34) [All]*

Lac. A (Clem) Did

επεσπειρεν ℵ^{c} B Θ f^{1} 33 1241 a b UBS^{4} Clem] επεσπαρκεν ℵ* ; εσπειρεν rell

Matt. 14:12

καὶ γὰρ ὅτε Ἰωάννης μεμαρτύρηκε καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τὸ σῶμα ἔθαψαν + (*Apol. Fuga* 13:4-5) [All]*[30]

Lac. A (33) Clem Did

σωμα E W Δ Π Ω a b TR] πτωμα rell

==========

[29]This adaptation comes from Mt 13:13 because the parallel passage in Mk 4:12 is very different and Lk 8:10 has βλεποντες μη βλεπωσιν.

[30]This is an allusion to Mt 14:12 instead of Mk 6:29 because it is immediately followed by a citation from Mt 14:13 and because it contains εθαψαν instead of the Marcan εθηκαν.

Matt. 14:13

+ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ᾽ ἰδίαν (*Apol. Fuga* 13:5-7) [C][31]

Lac. A (33) Clem Did

ο Ἰησους rell] omit Θ

Matt. 15:11 (= Mk 7:15)

οὐ τὰ εἰσερχόμενα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐξερχόμενα (*Ep. ad Amun*) [Ad]*[32]

μὴ τὰ εἰσερχόμενα κοινοῦν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐξερχόμενα (*Ep. ad Amun*) [Ad]*

Lac. A k Did

τα εισερχομενα Clem] το εισερχομενον rell ; το ερχομενον B ; το εισπορευομενον 1241

τα εξερχομενα (E^*) Clem] το εκπορευμενον E^c rell

ου rell] add παν D

κοινοι rell] κοινωνει D

Matt. 15:13

πᾶσα φυτεία ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος ἐκριζωθήσεται (*De Synodis* 33:4) [C]

==========

[31]This citation is taken from Mt 14:13 because it contains ακουσας... εκειθεν which is missing from Mk 6:32 and Lk 9:10.

[32]These adaptations come from Mt 15:11 rather than Mk 7:15 because they contain a form of εισερχομαι, whereas Mk 7:15 uses a form of εισπορευομαι. εισερχομενα does not appear as a variant in the manuscript tradition of Mk 7:15.

Lac. A k Clem

Matt. 18:6 (= Mk 9:42; cf. Lk 17:2)

ὃς οὖν ἐὰν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων, συμφέρει αὐτῷ, ἵνα μύλος ὀνικὸς κρεμασθῇ εἰς τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης (*De Synodis* 2:4) [C][33]

μύλον ὀνικὸν κρεμασθῆναι εἰς τὸν τράχηλον καὶ καταποντισθῆναι ἢ σκανδαλίσαι κἂν ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν (*Apol. contra Arianos* 21:4 - taken from the *Letter of Julius to the Eusebian Bishops* [340 CE]) [Ad]*

Lac. A C k (Clem)

μυλος ονικος κρεμασθη Did] κρεμασθη μυλος ονικος (L) rell [NA: Clem]

εις τον τραχηλον (e) rell] περι τον τραχηλον ℵ B L 33 892 (e) UBS[4] Did ; επι τον τραχηλον D 565 (e) TR ; εν τω τραχηλω 700 a b [Lac. Clem]

τουτων rell] omit a

μυλος ονικος rell] λιθος μυλικος L

Matt. 18:19

ἐὰν δύο συμφωνήσαιεν περὶ παντὸς οὗ ἐὰν αἰτήσωνται, γενήσεται αὐτοῖς (*Apol. Const.* 16:20-22) [Ad]*

==========

[33]This citation and the following adaptation are taken from Mt 18:6 rather than Mk 9:42 or Lk 17:2 because: (1) they contain a form of κρεμαννυμι (Mk and Lk have περικειται) and (2) they contain a form of καταποντιζω (Mk has βεβληται and Lk has ερριπται). In addition, the citation contains: (1) συμφερει αυτω, agreeing with Mt 18:6, whereas Mk 9:42 reads καλον εστιν αυτων μαλλον (this section is missing in Lk 17:2); and (2) εν τω πελαγει, which is missing in Mk and Lk.

Lac. A C k Clem Did

εαν δυο συμφωνησουσιν (εξ υμων) ℵ B L 33 892 a UBS^{4}] δυο εαν συμφωνησωσιν εξ υμων D ; εαν δυο εξ υμων συμφωνησωσιν Θ f^{13} 700 b e$_{34}$; εαν δυο υμων συμφωνησωσιν (E) (Δ) rell

εαν^{2} (f^{13}) rell] αν D 892 [NA: a b e]

αιτησωνται... αυτοις rell] αιτησησθε... υμιν b e

γενησεται rell] δοθησεται 33 e

ου rell] ο W [NA: a b e]

γενησεται αυτοις rell] αυτοις γενησεται ℵ

Matt. 18:20

ὅπου δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰσὶν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου, ἐκεῖ ἐστιν ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν ὁ κύριος (*Apol. contra Arianos* 6:7 - taken from the *Circular Letter of Egyptian Bishops* [338/339 CE]) [Ad]*

Lac. A C k (Clem) (Did)

οπου ℵ^{c} Θ f^{13} a b e] ουκ D ; ου ℵ* rell [Lac. Clem Did]

εκει rell] add και εγω a b e [Lac. Clem]

εισιν rell] εσονται e

η ℵ^{c} rell] omit ℵ* ; και Clem

εκει rell] omit e ; παρ᾽ οις ουκ D ; παρ᾽ οις Clem

==========

[34]Athanasius agrees with 33 and a in omitting εξ υμων, but due to the fragmentary character of his adaptation (he also omits επι της γης and πραγματος), one cannot determine with certainty whether his text contained εξ υμων or not. Athanasius' adaptation is clear enough to indicate the word order in this verse.

Matt. 19:4 (= Mk 10:6)

οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ὁ κτίσας ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς; + (*De Inc.* 2:36-37) [C]**[35]

ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς δὲ ὁ κτίσας ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 45) [C]

ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς δὲ ὁ κτίσας αὐτοὺς ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 57) [Ad]*

Lac. A k (Clem) Did

ο κτισας απ᾽ αρχης B Θ f^1 33 700 e UBS^4 (ʿAth)] ο ποιησας απ᾽ αρχης (L) rell [NA: Clem]

θηλυ D^c rell] θηλυν D^* [NA: a b e; Lac. Clem]

Matt. 19:5 (cf. Mk 10:7-8)

+ καὶ εἶπεν, ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ προσκολληθήσεται τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν (*De Inc.* 2:37-40) [C][36]

Lac. A k (Clem) Did

ενεκεν rell] ενεκα ℵ B L UBS^4 [NA: a b e; Lac. Clem]

πατερα rell] add αυτου C E Δ f^1 f^{13} 33 1241 [Lac. Clem]

==========

[35]This citation and the following citation and adaptation are taken from Mt 19:4 instead of Mk 10:6 because they contain κτισας instead of the Marcan κτισεως. In addition, the first citation contains ουκ ανεγνωτε οτι, which is missing in Mk.

[36]This citation most likely is taken from Mt 19:5 rather than Mk 10:7-8 because it contains και ειπεν, which is missing in most manuscripts of Mk. In addition, other gospel citations found in the context of *De Inc* 2 come from Mt 19 rather than Mk 10.

αυτου W 1241] omit rell [Lac. Clem]

προσκολληθησεται rell] κολληθησεται B D E W Θ Ω f^{13} a UBS^4 [Lac. Clem]

και rell] omit e [Lac. Clem]

ειπεν Δ^c rell] add αυτοις Δ^* [Lac. Clem]

τουτου rell] add το 565 [NA: a b e ; Lac. Clem]

Matt. 19:6 (cf. Mk 10:9)

ὃ οὖν ὁ θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω (*De Inc.* 2:40-41) [C][37]

Lac. A k Did

συνεζευξεν b rell] add εις εν D a e

---

o^2 rell] omit 1241 [NA: a b e]

μη χωριζετω (b e) rell] μη αποχωριζετω D (b e) ; *non licet separari* a

Matt. 19:28 (cf. Lk 18:30)

καὶ οἱ μὲν καθέζονται ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (*De Decr.* 10:2) [Ad]*[38]

---

[37]Since this citation immediately follows a citation from Mt 19:4-5 (after a short introductory clause), it is highly probable that it is taken from Mt 19:6 rather than Mk 10:9. Since Mt 19:6 and Mk 10:9 agree in wording, there is nothing besides context that can be used to identify Athanasius' biblical source.

[38]This is an allusion to Mt 19:28 rather than Lk 18:30 because it contains δωδεκα before θρονους (missing in Lk) and it follows the Matthean word order exactly.

This adaptation also attests the following variants for the number "twelve" (found twice in the verse) and the

---

Lac. A k Clem

τας rell] omit D [NA: a b e; Lac. A]

Matt. 22:30 (= Mk 12:25, Lk 20:35)

ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ᾽ εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 69) [C][39]

Lac. A C (a) k (Clem)[expl. γαμιζονται] Did

γαμιζονται ℵ B D L f^{1} 892 UBS^{4} $Clem^{pt}$] γαμισκονται W Θ f^{13} 33 700 $Clem^{pt}$; εκγαμιζονται E Π Ω 565 1241 TR [NA: b e ; Lac. a][40]

εισιν ως (οι) αγγελοι f^{1} a b (e)] ως (οι) αγγελοι... εισιν (f^{13}) rell [Lac. Clem]

αγγελοι rell] οι αγγελοι Θ f^{1} [NA: a b e ; Lac. Clem][41]

==========

spelling of "Israel:"

δωδεκα[1] rell] δεκαδυο D ; ιβ ℵ ; *duodecim* e ; XII a b

δωδεκα[2] rell] ιβ ℵ D ; *duodecim* e ; XII a b [Lac. A]

Ισραηλ rell] Ιστραηλ W a b e

[39]This citation is taken from Mt 22:30 rather than Mk 12:25 or Lk 20:35 because it contains εν γαρ τη αναστασει in place of Mark's οταν γαρ εκ νεκρων αναστωσιν or Luke's και της αναστασεως της εκ νεκρων.

[40]Jacob Geerlings identifies the text of f^{13} as γαμισκονται (supported by mss 124 and 788 and possibly 69 (εκγαμισκονται)) but several members of f^{13} approximate the Byzantine reading εκγαμιζονται (εγγαμιζονται = 174 346 543 826 828 983; ενγαμιζονται = 13; and εκγαμιζονται = 230). See Geerlings' discussion of this variant on p. 18.

[41]A complete collation of this variant reading is:

αγγελοι B D E^{*} 700 (a b e) UBS^{4}] οι αγγελοι Θ f^{1} (a b e) ; αγγελοι θεου ℵ L f^{13} 33 892 1241 ; αγγελοι του θεου E^{c} W Δ Π Ω 565 TR [Lac. Clem]

Since Athanasius' text ends at αγγελοι, it is not certain

Matt. 24:3 (cf. Mk 13:4; Lk 21:7)

εἰπὲ ἡμῖν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται; καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας; (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 54) [C][42]

Lac. A k Clem (Did)[inc. ποτε]

ειπε rell] ειπον L f^1 33 [NA: a b e; Lac. Did]

σης παρουσιας rell] παρουσιας σου D a b e

ποτε rell] τοτε C

Matt. 24:15 (cf. Mk 13:14-16; Lk 21:20-21)

ὅταν οὖν ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου ἑστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω + (*Apol. Fuga* 11:19-21) [C][43]

Lac. A C k Clem Did

εστος ℵ B* D^c L W Δ Π 33 565 892 TR UBS^4] εστως B^c D* E Θ Ω f^1 f^{13} 700 1241 [NA: a b e]

==========

whether his text contained (του) Θεου or not, but it is clear that his text did not include the article οι before αγγελοι.

[42]This citation is taken from Mt 24:3 rather than Mk 13:4 or Lk 21:7 because it contains της σης παρουσιας instead of οταν μελλη ταυτα which is found in Mk and Lk.

[43]The close verbal similarities between the long citation in *Apol. Fuga* 11 and Mt 24:15-18 make it certain that Mt 24 is being cited rather than Mk 13:14-16 or Lk 21:20-21a. In addition, this citation immediately follows a citation from Mt 10:23 and is introduced by the statement και μετ᾽ ολιγα φησιν, "and shortly after he says..."

This citation of Mt 24:15 also gives evidence concerning the following variant in the spelling of "Daniel:"

Δανιηλ ℵ^c D^c rell] ιηλ ℵ* ; Δανιηλου D*

Matt. 24:16

+ τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη + (*Apol. Fuga* 11:21-22) [C][44]

Lac. A C k Did

εις B D Δ Θ f^1 700 892 a b e UBS^4] επι rell

Matt. 24:17

+ καὶ ὁ ἐπι τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβήτω ἆραι τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ + (*Apol. Fuga* 11:22-23) [C]

Lac. A C k Did

και ο επι 700 a b Clem] ο επι rell ; ο δε επι D 33 e[45]

καταβατω ℵ*(ℵ^c-βητω) B D L Θ 33 700 892 UBS^4 Clem] καταβαινετο rell [NA: a b e][46]

τα ℵ^c B E^c L W Δ Π Ω f^{13} 565 700 892 1241 UBS^4] τι D E* Θ f^1 33 TR a b e Clem ; το ℵ*

αυτου rell] omit D a b

δωματος rell] add εστιν e

==========

[44]This citation gives evidence concerning the following variant in the spelling of "Judea:"

Ιουδαια ℵ^c rell] Ιουδεα ℵ* Θ

[45]Although conjunctions are not normally included in the collations and statistical analysis, in this case, I included a variant concerning a conjunction because it is found in the middle of a long citation. Athanasius would have had little reason to change the conjunction to fit this citation into his context.

[46]Athanasius agrees with ℵ^c in reading καταβητω against the reading found in ℵ* (καταβατω).

Matt. 24:18

+ καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ μὴ ὑποστρεψάτω ὀπίσω ἆραι τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ (*Apol. Fuga* 11:23-24) [C]

Lac. A C k Did

(υπο/επι)στρεψατο rell] add εις τα 33 700

οπισω rell] omit a b Clem

τα ιματια E W Δ Ω 1241 TR] το ιματιον (Θ) rell

αγρω rell] add εστιν e

υποστρεψατο] επιστρεψατο rell [NA: a b e]

Matt. 25:34

δεῦτε οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου (*De Decr.* 10:2) [C]

δεῦτε, οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου, κατακληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (*Ep. Festales XLIII* in *Cosmam Indicopleustam*) [C]

δεῦτε, οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 76) [C]

Lac. C e k Did

Matt. 25:35

ἐπείνων καὶ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν, ἐδίψων, καὶ ἐποτίσατέ με (*Hist. Arianorum* 61:1) [Ad]*

Lac. C (a)[inc. εποτισατε] e k Did

φαγειν Clem^{pt} rell] add και W Δ Clem^{pt} [Lac. a]

εποτισατε με Clem^{pt} rell] εδωκατε μοι πιειν a b Clem^{pt}

εδωκατε rell] εδωκας b [Lac. a]

Matt. 26:45 (= Mk 14:41)

καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλῶν (*Apol. Fuga* 13:26-28) [C][47]

Lac. (33) e k Clem Did

το rell] omit B C L W 892 1241 [NA: a b ; Lac. 33]

ιδου γαρ ηγγικεν B E] ιδου ηγγικεν rell ; ηγγικεν γαρ Θ f^1

και ο υιος του ανθρωπου rell] του υιου του ανθρωπου και L 892

παραδιδοται rell] παραδοθησεται 700 a

εις χειρας rell] εν χειρασι a b

ωρα rell] add μου f^1

Matt. 26:64

λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπ᾽ ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως, καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρός (*De Inc.* 56:19-21) [C][48]

Lac. e k Clem Did

επι rell] μετα 700 a b

υμιν rell] add οτι D

==========

[47]This citation is taken from Mt 26:45 rather than Mk 14:41 because: (1) it contains ιδου γαρ ηγγικεν instead of the Marcan απεχει ηλθεν; (2) it contains και instead of the Marcan ιδου; (3) it places παραδιδοται after υιος του ανθρωπου instead of before (as in Mk); and (4) it lacks definite articles before both χειρας and αμαρτωλων which are found in Mark.

[48]The ending of this citation, εν τη δοξη του πατρος, could represent a conflation with Mt 16:27. No other witnesses attext this reading.

Matt. 27:20 (= Mk 15:11)

[ὡς ἐκεῖνοι] τὸν Βαραββᾶν ᾐτήσαντο (*Apol. Contra Arianos* 82:3) [All]*[49]

ὅτι καὶ τότε οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν μὲν Βαραββᾶν αἰτησάμενοι (*Historia Arianorum* 68) [All]*

τούς τε τὸν Βαραβᾶν αἰτησαμένους ἀντὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 2) [All]*

Lac. C e k Clem Did

Matt. 27:24

(ἦ Πιλᾶτος·) ὁ μὲν γὰρ κἂν ἐνίψατο συνορῶν τὴν ἀδικίαν (*Hist. Arianorum* 68:3) [All]

Lac. C e k Clem Did

Matt. 27:51

(ὅ τε γὰρ ἥλιος ἀπεστράφη,) καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐσείετο, (καὶ τὰ ὄρη ἐρρήγνυτο, πάντες κατέπτησσον) (*De Inc.* 19:14-15) [All]*

(ὁ μὲν ἥλιος ἐσκοτίσθη) ἡ δὲ γῆ ἐσείετο; (*De Inc.* 49:4) [All]*

Lac. Clem Did

εσεισθη rell] εσχισθη W

==========

[49]These three allusions are taken from Mt 27:20 because they contain forms of the verb αιτεω which is missing in Mk 15:11.

These allusions attest the following variant spellings of "Barabbas:"

Βαραββαν Ath^{pt} rell] Βαραβαν L Ath^{pt} ; Βαρραββαν Θ

Matt. 28:19

πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*Epistola Eusebii* 3 = *De Decr.* 33:5) [C]**

πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*Ep. Encyclica* 1:8) [C]

πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*De Synodis* 23:5 - taken from the Arian document, the *2nd Confession* or *2nd of Antioch* [341 CE]) [C]

ἐκέλευσε γὰρ ἡμᾶς βαπτίζεσθαι οὐκ εἰς ὄνομα ἀγενήτου καὶ γενητοῦ οὐδὲ εἰς ὄνομα ἀκτίστου καὶ κτίσματος, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*De Decr.* 31:3) [Ad]

πορευθέντες βαπτίζετε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*De Synodis* 28:11 - taken from the *7th Confession* or *2nd Sirmian* [357 CE]) [Ad]

κελεύσας ἡμᾶς βαπτίζεσθαι οὐκ εἰς ὄνομα ἀγενήτου καὶ γενητοῦ, οὐδὲ εἰς ὄνομα κτίστου καὶ κτίσματος, ἀλλ᾽εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 34) [Ad]

μαθητεύσατε εἶθ᾽ οὕτω βαπτίζετε εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 42) [Ad]

καὶ βαπτιζομένους ἐν ὀνόματι πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*De Synodis* 29:9) [All]

οἵ τε μαθηταὶ ἐμαθήτευσαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 59) [All]

Lac. C L k (Clem)[inc. εις] (Did)[expl. εθνη]

πορευθεντες rell] πορευεσθε D e [Lac. Clem]

πορευθεντες ℵ A E Ω f^{13} 700 Did] add ουν B W Δ Θ Π f^{1} 33 565 892 1241 (e) TR UBS^{4} ; add νυν D a b [Lac. Clem]

βαπτιζοντες rell] βαπτισαντες B D [NA: a b e Clem; Lac. Did]

εις το ονομα rell] εν τω ονοματι a b e

του[1] rell] omit Clem [NA: a b e; Lac. Did]
του[2] rell] omit D Clem [NA: a b e; Lac. Did]
του[3] rell] omit Clem [NA: a b e; Lac. Did]

MARK

Mark 2:11 (cf. Mt 9:6; Lk 5:24; Jn 5:8)

ἔγειραι, ἆρον τὸν κράββατόν σου καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου
(*De Synodis* 49:5) [C][50]

Lac. Ψ (579) k Clem Did

εγειραι rell] add και A E W Δ Π Ω f^1 700 1241 TR

(σοι λεγω) εγειραι rell] εγειρε σοι λεγω ℵ ; omit 579

==========

[50]This citation comes from Mk 2:11 rather than Mt 9:6 or Lk 5:24 because it contains κραββατον instead of κλινην which is found in Mt and Lk. Even though Jn 5:18 also uses κραββατον, the rest of the citation distinguishes itself as a citation from Mark.

This citation provides evidence concerning the following variation in the spelling of κραββατον:

κραββατον B^c 565 579 1071 TR] κραβαττον B^* rell ;
κραββαττον Ω ; κραβακτον ℵ ; κραβατγον 33

LUKE

Luke 1:1

ἐπειδήπερ τινες ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι (*Ep. Festales XXXIX* 3) [All]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C (a)[expl. πολλοι] Clem Did

Luke 1:2

καθὼς παρέδωκαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 32) [C][51]

ἅπερ οἱ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου γενόμενοι παραδεδώκασιν (*De Decretis* 27.4) [Ad]*

καθὼς παρέδωκαν τοῖς πατράσιν οἱ ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λογοῦ + (*Ep. Festales XXXIX* 3) [Ad]*[52]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} (C)[inc. και] a Clem (Did)[inc. οι]

παρεδωκαν Ⅱ Ψ^{*} 892] παρεδοσαν Ψ^{c} rell [NA: b e; Lac. C Did]

καθως rell] καθα D [Lac. C Did][53]

==========

[51]It is rather uncharacteristic of Athanasius to identify which Gospel he is citing. Here he states that the Gospel of Luke is his source: και του Λουκα... Other instances where Athanasius identifies Luke as his source will be noted in the footnotes.

[52]P. Joannou's critical edition contains παρεδοσαν, but two manuscripts of the 39th Festal Letter contain the variant παρεδωκαν. After examination of Athanasius's other references to this verse, I think παρεδωκαν is more likely original in this case as well.

[53]J. Geerlings' text of f^{13} omits οι before αυτοπται. None of the other critical texts consulted (including the IGNTP) mention this omission. Since Geerling's apparatus does not mention this as a variant, I consider Geerling's omission of the article to be a typographical error.

γενομενοι rell] γενομενου C ; omit Did

Luke 1:3

+ ἔδοξε κἀμοί (προτραπέντι παρὰ γνησίων ἀδελφῶν καὶ μαθόντι) ἄνωθεν ἑξῆς (ἐκθέσθαι τὰ κανονιζόμενα καὶ παραδοθέντα πιστεύθεντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία) (*Ep. Festales XXXIX* 3) [Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} a Clem Did

ανωθεν rell] omit Ψ

Luke 1:27

(ὁ δὲ Γαβριὴλ ἀποστέλλεται πρὸς αὐτήν, οὐχ ἁπλῶς πρὸς παρθένον, ἀλλὰ) πρὸς παρθένον μεμνηστευμένην ἀνδρί (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5) [Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} Ω (a)[expl. παρθενον] Clem Did

μεμνηστευμενην $\aleph^{c}$ B^{c} W^{c} (b e) rell] εμνηστευμενην $\aleph^{*}$ A B L W^{*} (b e) UBS^{4} ; μεμνησμενην D [Lac. a]

προς παρθενον rell] add Μαριαμ b [Lac. a]

Luke 1:35

(καὶ ὁ Γαβριὴλ δὲ ἀσφαλῶς εὐηγγελίζετο αὐτῇ λεγῶν οὐχ ἁπλῶς) τὸ γεννώμενον ἐν σοί (ἵνα μὴ ἔξωθεν ἐπεισαγόμεν αὐτῇ σῶμα νομισθῇ, ἀλλ᾽) ἐκ σοῦ (ἵν᾽ ἐξ αὐτῆς φύσει) τὸ γεννώμενον (εἶναι πιστευθῇ) (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5) [Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} (Clem)

γεννωμενον εκ σου C^{*} Θ f^{1} 33 a^{vid} e] γεννωμενον εν σοι Did ; γεννωμενον rell [Lac. Clem]

γεννωμενον rell] γενομενον $Θ^{*}$; γενωμενον $Θ^{c}$ [Lac. Clem]

Luke 2:1-2a

ἐτέθη δόγμα περὶ τῆς ἀπογραφῆς (*De Synodis* 4:2) [All]*[54]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} E Π (Clem) Did

αυτη απογραφη πρωτη εγενετο rell] omit e

Luke 2:7

καὶ τοῦ τίκτειν (μνημονεύει ἡ γραφὴ καί φησιν) ἐσπαργάνωσεν (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5) [Ad]*

καὶ ἀδύνατον γάλακτι τραφῆναι σῶμα καὶ σπαργανωθῆναι μὴ πρότερον φύσει τεχθεν (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5) [All]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C Π Clem Did

εσπαργανωσεν rell] εσπαργανωσαν e

Luke 2:21

τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ περιτμηθεν ὀκταήμερον (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5) [All]*

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C Clem Did

οκταημερον (565 = οκτω ημεραι)] ημεραι οκτω rell

Luke 2:23

διανοίξαντος τοῦ τεχθέντος τὴν μήτραν (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5) [All]

==========

[54]In this allusion, Athanasius identifies Luke as his source: καὶ ὥσπερ κατὰ τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Λουκᾶν.

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C Clem Did

Luke 2:28

τοῦτο Συμεὼν εἰς τὰς ἀγκάλας ἐδέξατο (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5) [All]*[55]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C Clem Did

αγκαλας (D) (W) a (= *amplexum*) rell] χειρας (b) (= *manibus*) e (= *manus*)

αγκαλας ℵ B L W Π 565 a b UBS^4] add αυτου rell

εις τας αγκαλας] εν ταις χερσι b

Luke 2:40

τοῦτο γέγονε παιδίον καὶ ηὔξησε (δωδεκαετὴς γενόμενος) (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5) [All]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C Did

Luke 2:42

(τοῦτο γέγονε παιδίον καὶ ηὔξησε) δωδεκαετὴς γενόμενος (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5) [All][56]

==========

[55]The name "Simeon" is mentioned in both Lk 2:25 and 2:34.

[56]Although a majority of the manuscripts of *Ep ad Epictetum* collated by Ludwig support δωδεκαετης or δωδεκαετες, a significant number contain the variant τρισκαιδεκαετης. The following collation is taken from Ludwig's critical text (p 9):

δωδεκαετης N q S] δωδεκαετες B V M E A ; τρισκαιδεκαετης O R C P Q L; και δεκαετης Ep

Athanasius' text might attest a variant in the spelling of "twelve," but the looseness of his allusion does not

---

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C Clem Did

Luke 3:23

καὶ εἰς τὸν τριακοστὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἦλθεν (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5) [All]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C Did

---

verse rell] omit 3:23-38 579

Luke 6:1 (= Matt. 12:1; Mark 2:23)

(καὶ ἀναγινώσκοντες δὲ τὰς τοῦ Δαυὶδ πράξεις, ἀντιμελέτων αὐταῖς καὶ ἤτιῶντο τούς ἀναιτίους) τίλλοντας στάχυας καὶ ψώχοντας ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου (*Apol. Fuga* 2:14-16) [All]*[57]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) (33)[inc. μαθηται] Clem Did

Luke 8:28 (cf. Mark 5:7)

(ἔα τί σοι καὶ ἡμῖν, υἱε θεοῦ;) δέομαί σου, μή με βασανίσῃς (*De Inc.* 32:22-23) [Ad][58]

==========

provide enough certainty to include it in the statistical analysis:

δωδεκα rell] δεκαδυο W f^1

[57]Only Lk 6:1 contains a reference to the disciples "rubbing" (ψωχοντας) the grain as well as plucking (τιλλοντας) it. The only significant variant which this allusion might attest concerns word order, but the allusion is too loose to provide a clear attestation.

[58]This adaptation represents a conflation of Mt 8:29 and Lk 8:28 (cf. footnote at Mt 8:29). The last half of this adaptation comes from Lk 8:28 rather than Mk 5:7 because it contains δεομαι σου instead of ορκιζω σε τον θεον found in Mk.

Lac. P^{45} Clem Did

Luke 8:52 (= Mt 9:24; Mk 5:39)

μὴ κλαίετε (θεόδωρον) οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει (*Ep. ad Orsisium II*) [Ad]*[59]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) Clem Did

ου γαρ rell] ουκ A E Π Ω 565 700 b e TR [Lac. P^{75}]
απεθανεν rell] add το κορασιον L Θ f^{1} 33 1071 1241[60]

Luke 10:18

ἐθεώρουν τὸν σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν πεσόντα (*De Inc.* 25:32) [C]

ὁ γὰρ διαφωνήσας διάβολος ἐθεωρήθη πίπτων ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν (ὡς εἶπεν ὁ κύριος) (*De Synodis* 48:4) [All]*

Lac. Clem Did

ως αστραπην πεσοντα P^{75} B 579 e] ως αστραπην εκ του ουρανου πεσοντα rell[61]

==========

[59]This citation comes from Lk 8:52 rather than Mt 9:24 or Mk 5:39 because it contains μη κλαιετε which is found only in Lk. ου γαρ appears in both Lk and Mt (Mk has ουκ), but Mt adds το κορασιον between απεθανεν and αλλα.

[60]The context of Athanasius' adaptation (in which he instructs his readers not to weep for the dead Theodorus) would not facilitate his inclusion of το κορασιον if it was in his text. The closeness in wording of the final section of his adaptation makes it unlikely that his biblical text included this.

[61]Athanasius' citation supports the reading found in P^{75} B 579 e (i.e. it does not place εκ του ουρανου between ως αστραπην and πεσοντα), but the citation does not show whether or not his text contains εκ του ουρανου. The allusion clearly indicates that his text did contain εκ του ουρανου, but it is not clear whether it followed ως

Luke 11:15 (cf. Mt 12:24; Mk 3:22)

ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια (*De Synodis* 50:2)
[Ad]*[62]

Lac. a e Clem

εκβαλλει τα δαιμονια rell] omit 1071
τα P^{45} rell] omit 579 [NA: b]

Luke 11:27

ἐμακαρίζοντο μαστοὶ, οὓς ἐθήλασεν (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 5)
[Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} Clem Did

μαστοι rell] μασθοι D 1241 [NA: a b e]

ους εθηλασας rell] οι σε εθηλασαν e

Luke 12:20

ἄφρον, ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ζητοῦσί σου τὴν ψυχήν· ἃ δὲ ἡτοίμασας τίνι ἔσται (*Apol. Fuga* 15:7-8) [Ad]*

Lac. (P^{45}) C (33)[inc. ταυτη]

==========

αστραπην πεσοντα (agreeing with P^{75} e) or whether it preceded the clause (agreeing with B 579).

[62]This is most likely taken from Lk 11:15 rather than Mt 12:24 or Mk 3:22 because of the word order (which differs in Mt and Mk). If so, this adaptation attests the following variant in the spelling of "Beelzebul:"

Βεελζεβουλ P^{45} rell] Βεεζεβουλ ℵ B Did ; Βεζεβουλ 579 ; Βελζεβουλ L b

αφρον Π Ω f^1 565 700 892 Clem] αφρων rell [Lac. P^{45} 33]

δε $Clem^{pt}$ rell] ουν D a e $Clem^{pt}$ [Lac. P^{45}][63]

τινι P^{45} $Clem^{pt}$ rell] τινος D a b e $Clem^{pt}$

εσται rell] γενηται Clem

Luke 12:33

καὶ πωλήσατε (λέγων) τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ δότε ἐλεημοσύνην (*Hist. Arianorum* 61:1) [Ad]*

Lac. C Clem Did

πωλσατε τα υπαρχοντα (υμων) (Ath) rell] τα υπαρχοντα υμων πωλησατε e

δοτε rell] δωτε Θ

Luke 17:2

ἢ ἵνα (ὡς ὁ Λουκᾶς προσέθηκε) σκανδαλίσῃ τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἕνα (*De Synodis* 2:4) [C][64]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) C 33 Clem Did

των μικρων τουτων ενα ℵ* B L Ψ (579) 892 UBS^4] ενα των μικρων τουτων ℵ^c rell [Lac. P^{75}]

σκανδαλιση rell] σκανδαλισει 579

των μικρων τουτων rell] τον μικρον τουτον 579

==========

[63]This δε was part of Athanasius' text since it appears in the middle of the adaptation.

[64]In this citation, Athanasius once again identifies Luke as his Gospel source.

Luke 17:21

ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν (*CG* 30:9-10) [C]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem (33)[...ει α - υμων]

Luke 18:2

μήτε τὸν θεὸν φοβούμενοι μήτε ἄνθρωπον ἐντρεπόμενοι (*Hist. Arianorum* 42:1) [All]*

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75})[inc. ...ι ανθρωπον] C 33 Clem (Did)

ανθρωπον rell] ανθρωπους W [Lac. 33]

Luke 21:8 (cf. Mt 24:4-5; Mk 13:5-6)

βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ. πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικε καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσι. μὴ πορευθῆτε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν (*Depositio Arii* 5 = *De Decr.* 35:18) [Ad][65]

==========

[65]This adaptation represents a conflation of Lk 21:8, Mk 13:5b-6, and Mt 24:4-5. The following text and variants appear in the triple tradition:

βλεπετε μη τις υμας πλανηση is found in all three gospels
- Mt: τις rell] τι 579
- Mk: no significant variants
- Lk: τις υμας 1071 Ath] omit rell
  πλανηση 1071(-ει) e Ath] πλανηθητε rell

πολλοι γαρ ελευσονται επι τω ονοματι μου λεγοντες οτι εγω ειμι is found in all three gospels
- Mt: οτι C Ath] omit rell
  ειμι Ath] add o Χριστος rell
- Mk: γαρ rell] omit B ℵ L W Ψ UBS^4
  οτι rell] omit D Θ 33 700
  ειμι rell] add o Χριστος W Θ f^{13} 565 579 700 1071
- Lk: επι rell] εν Π
  λεγοντες rell] omit 565
  οτι rell] omit B ℵ L 579 UBS^4
  ειμι rell] add o Χριστος e

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C b Clem Did

μη^{2} ℵ^{c} B D L Ψ 1241 a e UBS^{4}] add ουν rell
[NA: ℵ* - see omission below]

ο καιρος ηγγικεν μη ℵ^{c} rell] omit ℵ*

πορευθητε rell] ακολουθετε a

Luke 22:28

ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου + (*Ep. Festales XL* in *Cosmam Indicopleustam*) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) C 33 Clem Did

υμεις δε εστε (Θ) (b) (e) rell] και υμεις ηυξηθητε εν τη διακονια μου ως ο διακονων D

δε rell] omit Θ b[66]

δε εστε rell] εστε δε e

και ο καιρος ηγγικε is found only in Lk 21:8

και πολλους πλανησουσι is found only in Mt 24:5 and Mk 13:6

Mt: πλανησουσιν rell] πλανησωσιν Π*
Mk: πολλους rell] πολλου D
Lk: this clause is added before και ο καιρος ηγγικεν in e

μη πορευθητε οπισω αυτων is found only in Lk 21:8

Only the variants in the two distintinctively Lucan sections are included in the statistical analysis (see apparatus).

[66]Even though this variant could be significant, it is placed with the singular readings because it involves an introductory particle at the beginning of a citation.

Luke 22:29

+ κἀγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν, καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου, βασιλείαν + (*Ep. Festales XL* in *Cosmam Indicopleustam*) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) C 33 (b)[inc. διατιθεμαι] Clem Did

διατιθεμαι P^{75vid} (a b) rell] διατιθημι A Θ f^{1} 579 (a b) ; διαθησομαι e

υμιν P^{75vid} rell] add διαθηκην A Θ 579

μου rell] omit D e

καγω rell] εγω δε e [Lac. b]

διεθετο μοι rell] μοι διεθετο e

βασιλειαν rell] διαθηκην 579

Luke 22:30

+ ἵνα ἐσθίητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου (*Ep. Festales XL* in *Cosmam Indicopleustam*) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) C 33 Clem (Did)[inc. επι]

εσθιητε D^{c} (a b e) rell] εσθητε P^{75} B D^{*} (a b e) UBS^{4} ; εσθιετε Π 1071 [Lac. Did]

εν τη βασιλεια (μου) rell] omit E Ω 565

μου^{2} rell] omit D e ; των ουρανων Did [NA: E Ω 565 - see omission above]

πινητε rell] add μετ᾽ εμου f^{13} [Lac. Did]

τραπεζης μου rell] μου τραπεζης b

μου^{1} rell] add και b

Luke 23:43

ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ τοῦ ποτε ληστοῦ, ὅς διὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν ἐπαγγελίαν ἔλαβεν εὐθὺς εἰς τὸν παράδεισον ἔσεσθαι (*De Decr.* 6:6) [All]*[67]

Lac. P^{45} Clem (Did)[inc. σημερον]

παραδεισω rell] add του πατρος e

Luke 23:45

ὅ τε γὰρ ἥλιος ἀπεστράφη (*De Inc.* 19:3) [All]

ὁ μὲν ἥλιος ἐσκοτίσθη (*De Inc.* 49:4) [All]*

ὁ δὲ ἥλιος πλέον ἀγανακτῶν...ἀπέστραφη καὶ τὰς ἀκτῖνας συστεῖλας τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην ἀνήλιον ἔδειξεν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 7) [All]

διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν ὁ μὲν ἥλιος ὁρῶν τὸν δημιουργὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὑβριζομένῳ σώματι ἀνεχόμενον τὰς ἀκτῖνας συνέστειλε καὶ ἐσκότισε τὴν γῆν (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 10) [All]

Lac. P^{45} Clem Did

εσκοτισθη C^{c} (D) rell] εκλιποντος P^{75*} ℵ B C^{*vid} L 579 UBS[4] ; omit 33

Luke 24:1

(παρὰ δὲ Νικοδήμου καὶ τῶν περὶ Μαριὰμ δείκνυται... αἱ δὲ ὕπερ ἦσαν) ἑτοιμάσασαι ἀρώματα (εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμὸν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ κυρίου) (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 47) [Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} Clem Did

αρωματα rell] omit D a b e

==========

[67]The word ληστου appears to come from Mt 27:38 (= Mk 15:27) or Mt 27:44. Luke uses των κακουργων in 23:39 to refer to the two men who were crucified with Jesus.

Luke 24:18

ὁ μὲν οὖν κύριος τοὺς περὶ Κλεόπαν ἐντρέπων (ἐδίδασκεν ὅτι τὸν Χριστὸν δεῖ πρῶτον παθεῖν) (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 15) [All][68]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem Did

Luke 24:26

(ὁ μὲν οὖν κύριος τοὺς περὶ Κλεόπαν ἐντρέπων ἐδίδασκεν ὅτι) τὸν Χριστὸν δεῖ πρῶτον παθεῖν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 15) [All]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem Did

Luke 24:39

ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοῦς πόδας μου καὶ τοὺς τύπους τῶν ἥλων, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός· ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει, καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα + (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 7) [C]

οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα ὄντα, ἀλλ᾽ ἔχοντα (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 7) [Ad]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem Did

μου^{2} rell] omit P^{75} L W Θ f^{1} f^{13} 33 579 1071 e

και τους τυπους των ηλων 579] omit rell

εγω ειμι αυτος P^{75} ℵ B L 33 (579) a b UBS^{4}] αυτος εγω ειμι rell ; εγω αυτος ειμι D e

με rell] omit D W Θ a b e

σαρκα ℵ^{c} rell] σαρκας P^{75} ℵ* D

οστεα rell] οστα D 33 892

==========

[68]This allusion attests the following variant in the spelling of Cleopas:

Κλεοπας rell] Κλεωπας Ψ 579 [NA: a b e]

ιδετε[1] rell] add ιδου b

τας χειρας μου και τους ποδας μου rell] τους ποδας μου και τας χειρας μου ℵ

ειμι rell] add ο 579

οτι[2] rell] το D ; omit 1071

πνευμα rell] add και B

σαρκα και οστεα ουκ εχει rell] οστα ουκ εχει και σαρκας D

εμε rell] με W [NA: a b e]

θεωρειτε rell] βλεπετε D [NA: a b e]

Luke 24:40

+ καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐδείξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 7) [C][69]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem Did

και... ποδας rell] omit D a b e

εδειξεν P^{75} ℵ B L f^{1} 33 579 892 1241 UBS[4]] επεδειξεν rell [NA: D a b e - see omission above]

==========

[69]In his critical edition of Athanasius' Letter to Epictetus, Ludwig gives the reading επεδειξεν (found in mss A L M N O q). Two variant readings, υπεδειξεν (found in B V E? R Ep) and εδειξεν (found in C P Q), are found in the manuscript tradition. It is most probable that the original reading was εδειξεν. Manuscripts C P and Q, which contain εδειξεν, are older manuscripts and contain several original readings. It is much more likely that an original εδειξεν would have been changed at a later time to επεδειξεν or υπεδειξεν in order to make it agree with the Byzantine text. It is much less likely that an original επεδειξεν would have been shortened to εδειξεν (making it agree with the Alexandrian text) or altered to υπεδειξεν (for no apparent reason). For this reason, I consider εδειξεν as representing Athanasius' text.

JOHN

John 1:1

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*CG* 42:19-20) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. + (*De Decr.* 17:7) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Dep. Arii* 3 = *De Decr.* 35:12) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*De Sent. Dion.* 2:2) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν ἦν ὁ λόγος (*De Sent. Dion.* 9:3) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*De Sent. Dion.* 25:1) [C]

καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*De Synodis* 23:4; quotation from the Arian Second Confession of Antioch, CE 341) [C]

θεὸς γὰρ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*De Synodis* 49:2) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*De Synodis* 49:2) [C]

θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 9) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 11) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 24) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 41) [C]

(ὅτι) ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 1) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 7) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 8) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 32) [C]

καὶ θεὸς γὰρ ἦν (φησὶν) ὁ λόγος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 35) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ (μὲν) ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 51) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ (οὖν) ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 53) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 57) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ οὖν ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 62) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἦν λόγος ὁ τὸν λόγον προέμενος) ἦν γὰρ ὁ λόγος πρὸς τὸν θεόν (*De Sent. Dion.* 25:1; a quotation from the second book of Dionysius) [Ad]

καὶ θεός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 41) [Ad]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (καὶ γὰρ καὶ εἰ μὴ τὰ ἔργα ἔκτιστο ἀλλ᾽) ἦν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 56) [Ad]

θεὸς δέ ἐστιν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 49) [All]

Lac. P^{45} C W

και^{2} rell] add o L

John 1:2

\+ οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. + (*De Decr.* 17:7) [C]

Lac. P^{45} C W Clem

John 1:3

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*CG* 42:21) [C]**

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*De Inc.* 2:43-44) [C]

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (*De Decr.* 13:5) [C]

+ πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδέν (*De Decr.* 17:7) [C][70]

δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο πάντα (*Dep. Arii* 3 = *De Decr.* 35:12) [C]

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*De Sent. Dion* 2:2) [C]

πάντα γὰρ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (*De Synodis* 49:2) [C]

καὶ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ (ὡς Ἰωάννης φησὶν,) ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 19) [C]

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 56) [C]

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 5) [C]

καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 35) [C]

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 39) [C]

δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα γέγονε, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν; (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 13) [Ad]

δι᾽ αὐτοῦ μόνου τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 24) [Ad]

πάντα γὰρ ἐν σοφίᾳ γέγονε, καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 27) [Ad]

πάντα (γὰρ τά τε ὁρατὰ καὶ τα ἀόρατα) δι᾽ αὐτοῦ γέγονε καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο ουδὲ ἕν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 39) [Ad][71]

(πῶς δὲ καὶ) πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο; (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 50) [Ad]

==========

[70]This is the only reference of Athanasius that contains the reading οὐδέν instead of οὐδὲ ἕν. In the manuscript tradition of *De Decretis*, only one manuscript (V) contains the alternate reading οὐδὲ ἕν.

[71]In this adaptation, Athanasius conflates Jn 1:3 with Col. 1:16.

καὶ πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ γέγονε (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 51) [Ad]

ὅτι πάντα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 71) [Ad]

(ὅτι πάντα ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐκτίσθη,) καὶ χωρὶς αὐτῆς ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 81) [Ad]

δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 82) [Ad]

δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο (*De Sent. Dion.* 8:4) [All]

δι᾽ αὐτοῦ γέγονε τὰ πάντα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 38) [All]

Lac. P^{45} (C)[inc. ουδε] W Ω

ουδε εν $\aleph^{c}$ C^{vid} rell] ουδεν P^{66} $\aleph^{*}$ D f^{1} Did [NA: a b e]

John 1:9

ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον (*De Synodis* 49:2) [C]

αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστι τὸ φῶς, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 43) [Ad]

Lac. P^{45} W

John 1:12

ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι (*De Decr.* 6:3) [C]

ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 43) [C]

ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ + (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 59) [C]

Lac. P^{45} W (Clem)[inc. εδωκεν - expl. γενεσθαι] Did

δε rell] omit D e [Lac. Clem][72]

ελαβον B^c rell] ελαβαν B^*

John 1:13

+ οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 59) [C]

Lac. P^{45} W (Clem)[inc. ουκ... expl. σαρκος] (Orig)[omit ουδε[1]... σαρκος] Did

οι D^c rell] omit D^* a ; ος b [Lac. Clem]

ουδε εκ θεληματος ανδρος $\aleph^c$ B^c D^c rell] ουδε θεληματος ανδρος $\aleph^*$ D^* ; omit B^* [Lac. Clem]

εγεννηθησαν B^c rell] εγενηθησαν P^{75} A B^* Δ Θ Ω ; εγεννηθη b [Lac. Clem]

εξ αιματων rell] εξ αιματος b

ουδε εκ θεληματος σαρκος E^c rell] omit E^* (Orig?)[73]

εκ[2] rell] add του E [NA: a b e; Lac. Clem]

John 1:14

ὁ γὰρ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*De Decr.* 14:4) [C]

καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο [ἐπήγαγεν εὐθύς] καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας (*De Decr.* 15:2) [C]

==========

[72]It is quite certain that Athanasius' text contained the introductory δε since he gives identical citations with the conjunction in two separate works.

[73]Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes attribute the agreement between E^* and Origen to the looseness of Origen's citation rather than to textual affinity (see Origen, p. 53, fn 5). For this reason, I do not include it as a significant variant.

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*De Sent. Dion.* 8:2) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*De Sent. Dion.* 9:3) [C]

ὁ γὰρ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*De Sent. Dion.* 9:3) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*De Sent. Dion.* 27:2) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*De Synodis* 27:3.12; quotation from the Arian First Creed of Sirmium 351 CE) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 8) [C]

ὁ γὰρ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 25) [C]

οὗτος ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 41) [C]

ὁ γὰρ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 44) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 53) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 53) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 53) [C]

(ὅτε γὰρ) ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 64) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 1) [C]

(ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε) ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 7) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 8) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 39) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 44) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 47) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (τότε καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τίθησι δι᾽ ἣν γέγονε λέγων) καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 53) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 59) [C]

ἐθεασάμεθα γὰρ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 62) [C]

γέγονεν [ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης φησίν] ὁ λόγος σάρξ (*De Sent. Dion* 26:3) [Ad]

καὶ λόγος ὢν γέγονε σάρξ (*De Synodis* 45:6) [Ad]

(διὰ τοῦτο) θεὸς ὤν ὁ λόγος γέγονε σάρξ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 44) [Ad]

εἰ δὲ ὁ λόγος γέγονε σὰρξ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 45) [Ad]

διὰ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι αὐτὸν σάρκα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50) [Ad]

οὖσα λόγος γέγονε σὰρξ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 81) [Ad]

ὅτι μὴ ὁ πατήρ ἐστιν ὁ γενόμενος σάρξ, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ τούτου λόγος (*De Decr.* 25:3) [All]

ὡς γὰρ λόγος ὢν, σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 60) [All]

TEXT:

καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας

Lac. P^{45} W (Clem)[expl. εγενετο]

μονογενους rell] add υιου a

παρα rell] omit e

πληρης rell] πληρη D [Lac. Clem]

και^{4} B^{c} rell] omit B^{*}

John 1:16

ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλαβομεν (*De Synodis* 38:4) [C]

ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ λαμβάνομεν (*De Sent. Dion.* 10:5) [All]

ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ λαμβάνοντες (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50) [All]

Lac. P^{45} (D)[expl. παντες] W

εκ του πληρωματος αυτου ημεις παντες ελαβομεν rell]
παντες εκ του πληρωματος αυτου ελαβομεν Clem

John 1:17

ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 60) [C]

ὁ μὲν νόμος διὰ Μωσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ δὲ χάρις διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο (*De Sent. Dion* 11:2) [Ad][74]

Lac. P^{45} D W (Did)[inc. η]

Ιησου Χριστου $\aleph^{c}$ rell] Χριστου Ιησου 565 ; Ιησου $\aleph^{*}$

John 1:18

ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο (*De Decr.* 13:5) [C]

ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο (*De Decr.* 21:4) [C]

==========

[74]Athanasius attests the following two spellings of Moses:

Μωυσεως P^{66} P^{75} $\aleph$ B C L Δ Θ Π Ψ Ω^{vid} 33 579 UBS^{4} $Clem^{pt}$ Ath^{pt}] Μωσεως A E f^{1} f^{13} (565) 700 892 1241 TR $Clem^{pt}$ Orig Ath^{pt}

He also attests both readings of the following variant concerning the presence of the conjunction δε, but because one of his references is an adaptation, it is not certain that δε was in his text. It is not included in the statistical analysis:

η χαρις $Clem^{pt}$ Ath^{pt} rell] η δε χαρις P^{66} a b e $Clem^{pt}$ Ath^{pt} ; η χαρις γαρ Did

ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 62) [C]

διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ μονογενής ἐστι καὶ μόνος ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρός ἐστι (*De Decr.* 11:5) [All]

ὡς γὰρ υἱῷ θεοῦ ὄντι ἁρμόζει καλῶς τὸ ἀιδίως εἶναι καὶ ἐν κόλποις εἶναι τοῦ πατρός (*De Decr.* 14:3) [All]

Lac. P^{45} D W

ο μονογενης υιος C^{c} $Clem^{pt}$ rell] ο μονογενης θεος P^{75} $\aleph^{c}$ 33 $Clem^{pt}$ Orig ; μονογενης θεος P^{66} $\aleph^{*}$ B C^{*} L UBS^{4} Did

ο ων $\aleph^{c}$ rell] omit $\aleph^{*}$ a

υιος rell] add αυτου a

εις rell] omit a

εις τον κολπον rell] εν τοις κολποις 565

εκεινος rell] omit Did

John 2:4

οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου (*Apol. Fuga* 13:23-24) [C]

Lac. P^{45} C D W Clem Orig Did

John 2:9

τίς δὲ ἰδὼν καὶ τὴν ὑδατων ἀλλασσομένην οὐσίαν καὶ εἰς οἶνον μεταβάλλουσαν (*De Inc.* 18:6) [All]

τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνος ἐγίνετο (*De Decr.* 1:3) [All]

Lac. P^{45} C D W Orig Did

John 3:3

ἐὰν μὴ τις ἀναγεννηθῇ (*De Inc.* 14:10-11) [Ad]

Lac. P^{45} C D W Clem Orig Did

John 3:17

οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι᾽ αὐτοῦ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 55) [C]

ὅτι ἦλθεν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οὐχ ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα πάντας λυτρώσηται, καὶ σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι᾽ αὐτοῦ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 60) [Ad]

Lac. P^{45} C D W Clem Orig Did

αυτου[1] (Θ) rell] omit P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B L f^{1} 565 UBS^{4}

αυτου[1] (see above)] αυτον Θ

εις τον κοσμον rell] omit e

ινα κρινη τον κοσμον[2] P^{66c} rell] omit P^{66*}

John 4:24

πνεῦμα γάρ [φησίν] ὁ θεός (*De Sent. Dion* 15:5; found in a quotation from Dionysius' "Refutation and Defense") [Ad]

Lac. P^{45} W

John 5:17

ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 20) [C]

ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 29) [C]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem Did

John 5:18

διὰ τοῦτο οὖν μᾶλλον ἐδίωκον αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἔλυε τὸ Σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν θεὸν, ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 12) [Ad]*[75]

λέγοντος δὲ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ πατέρα ἴδιον εἶναι τὸν θεόν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 15) [Ad]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem (Orig)[inc. αλλα - expl. θεον]

ουν rell] omit ℵ D a b e [NA: Did ; Lac. Orig][76]

αλλα και rell] αλλ᾽ οτι και Θ f^{13} a (ᶠb) e Did

αυτον rell] omit 33 [Lac. Orig]

==========

[75]This adaptation most likely represents a conflation between Jn 5:16 and Jn 5:18. The verb εδιωκον is found in Jn 5:16, although it is also found in a few witness of Jn 5:18, as can be seen in the following:

εδιωκον αυτον οι Ιουδαιοι Ath]
εζητουν αυτον οι Ιουδαιοι αποκτειναι P^{75} ℵ A B L Θ Ψ Ω f^{1} f^{13} 565 700 892 a b (e) TR UBS^{4} ;
εζητουν αυτον αποκτειναι οι Ιουδαιοι W ;
οι Ιουδαιοι εζητουν αυτον αποκτειναι P^{66} D d ;
εζητουν οι Ἰουδαιοι αποκτειναι 33 ;
εζητουν αποκτειναι Ιησουν Did ;
εδιωκον οι Ιουδαιοι τον Ιησουν και εζητουν αυτον αποκτειναι 579 1241 ;
[Lac. Orig]

Because of the strong possibility of conflation, this variant is not included in the statistical analysis.

[76]Even though introductory particles are normally not included in statistical analysis, the omission of ουν has been included here for three reasons: (1) its appearance after δια τουτο makes it less likely to be accidentally inserted or omitted; (2) there is no apparent reason why Athanasius would add ουν to fit the context of *Orat. II contra Arianos* 12; and (3) the omission of ουν is limited to Western texts exclusively.

John 5:19

πάντα ὅσα βλέπω τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα, κἀγὼ ὁμοίως ποιῶ (*CG* 46:50-51) [Ad]*[77]

ἃ βλέπω τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα, ταῦτα κἀγὼ ποιῶ (*De Synodis* 49:2) [Ad]

ἃ βλέπω τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα, ταῦτα κἀγὼ ποιῶ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 41) [Ad]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem (Did)[inc. ταυτα]

ομοιως ποιει rell] ποιει ομοιως ℵ D a b ; ποιει e

τον πατερα ποιουντα rell] ποιουντα τον πατερα D [Lac. Did]

πατερα rell] add αυτου e [Lac. Did]

John 5:23

ἵνα γὰρ (φησί) τιμῶσι τὸν υἱόν, καθῶς τιμῶσι τὸν πατέρα (*De Synodis* 49:4) [C]

ὁ τιμῶν τὸν υἱὸν τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ὁ τὸν υἱὸν ἀτιμάζων ἀτιμάζει τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 33) [Ad]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem Did

John 5:36

τὰ ἔργα ἃ δέδωκέ μοι ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτὰ, ταὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιῶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμου (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 66) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) C Clem Orig Did

==========

[77]This represents a common adaptation of this verse which Athanasius uses in three separate works.

δεδωκε rell] εδωκεν A D E Δ Θ Π Ω 579 700 TR [Lac. P^{75}]

ταυτα P^{66}] omit 33 1241 ; αυτα rell [Lac. P^{75}]

α ποιω P^{66} P^{75vid} ℵ A B D L W f^{1} 33 565 579 892 b UBS^{4}] α εγω ποιω E (Δ) Θ Π Ψ Ω f^{13} 700 e TR ; omit 1241 a

---

τελειωσω rell] τελεσω f^{13} [NA: a b e; Lac. P^{75}]

ποιω] omit Δ

μαρτυρει rell] μαρτυρουσιν W [Lac. P^{75}]

περι εμου rell] omit a [Lac. P^{75}]

John 5:39

ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι αὐταί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ (*Ep. Festales XXXIX*) [C][78]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) C Clem

ερευνατε B^{c} (a b) rell] εραυνατε P^{66} ℵ B^{*} (a b) UBS^{4} Did ; ερευναμεν e [Lac. P^{75}]

οτι rell] εν αις a e

οτι Did] add υμεις δοκειτε εν αυταις ζωην αιωνιον εχειν και (^{f}D) (a) (e) rell

αυται W (b) e Did] εκειναι rell

αι μαρτυρουσαι D^{c} rell] αμαρτυρουσαι D^{*}

==========

[78]This represents a common paraphrase of this verse which is used by both Athanasius and Didymus in exactly the same form. Perhaps the middle section was left out because it implied that a person could not find eternal life by searching the Scriptures. This would go against both Athanasius' and Didymus' high view of Scripture.

John 6:30

τί ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμέν σοι; τί ἐργάζῃ; (*De Decr.* 1:3) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{66} C Π Clem Orig Did

ποιεις συ σημειον rell] ποιεις σημειον συ ℵ ; σοι ποιεις σημειον D b e ; ποιεις σημειον W 1241

σοι τι rell] οτι 579

John 6:38

καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμόν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με (*De Synodis* 23:4; quotation from the Dedication of Antioch 341 CE) [C]

καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐχ ἵνα ποιήσω τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με. + (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 54) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) (C)[inc. το θελημα^{1}] Clem Orig

καταβεβηκα εκ/απο του ουρανου ουχ P^{75vid} ℵ^{c} rell] ου καταβεβηκα εκ/απο του ουρανου ℵ* (b) e [Lac. C]

εκ rell] απο P^{66} A B L W Θ f^{13} 33 1241 UBS^{4} Did [NA: a b e; Lac. P^{75} C]

ποιησω ℵ D L W Ath^{pt}] ποιω Ath^{pt} rell [NA: a b e; Lac. C][79]

με rell] add πατρος D 700 892 a (ᶠb) e

καταβεβηκα rell] καταβη Δ [Lac. C]

το εμον rell] εμον 579

το θελημα^{2} rell] omit a

==========

[79]Since Athanasius attests both readings, this variant is not included in the statistical analysis.

John 6:39

+ τοῦτο δὲ ἐστι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με ἵνα πὰν ὃ δέδωκέ μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. + (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 54) [C]

Lac. P^{45} Clem Orig Did

τουτο... με $\aleph^{c}$ rell] omit $\aleph^{*}$ C 565

θελημα $\aleph^{c}$ rell] add αυτου a b [NA: $\aleph^{*}$ C 565 - see omission above]

πεμψαντος με $\aleph^{c}$ rell] add πατρος E Δ Θ Π Ω f^{13} 33 579 1241 a TR [NA: $\aleph^{*}$ C 565 - see omission above)

μη απολεσω rell] add μηδεν D a (b)

εξ αυτου rell] omit D e^{80}

αυτο L^{c} rell] αυτον E L^{*} W Δ 579 1241 a b e ; αυτωι 700 (= αυτῳ?)

εν $\aleph$ A D Π Ω f^{13} 33 1241 a b TR UBS^{4}] omit P^{66} P^{75} B C E L W Δ Θ Ψ f^{1} 565 579 700 892 e

---

δε rell] omit P^{75}

με rell] omit a

δεδωκε rell] εδωκεν P^{75}

αλλα rell] add ινα D

==========

[80]Reconstructing the Greek text underlying the Old Latin witnesses for this and the previous variant is difficult. The following represents my reconstrcution:

μη απολεσω εξ αυτου rell] μη απολεσω μηδεν D ; μη απολεσω εξ αυτου μηδεν b (= *non perdam ex eo quicquam*) ; μηδεν εξ αυτου απολεσω a (= *nihil ex illo perdam*) ; μη απολεσω e (= *non perdam*)

John 6:40

+ τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρα (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 54) [C][81]

Lac. P^{45} Orig Did

γαρ rell] omit P^{75} ; δε E Δ Ψ Ω 700 1241 TR[82]

του πατρος μου (L) rell] του πεμψαντος με A E Π Ω 700 TR ; του πεμψαντος με πατρος Δ Ψ f^{13}

και εγω αναστησω αυτον 1241] και αναστησω αυτον εγω (579) rell ; και αναστησω εγω αυτον Ψ ; και αναστησω αυτον P^{66} A D f^{1} b Clem

εν P^{66} ℵ A D L Π Ψ f^{13} 33 1241 a b UBS^{4} Clem] omit rell

---

τουτο... θελημα P^{66c} rell] omit P^{66*}

John 6:44

οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν κύριον, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτον ἑλκύσει πρὸς αὐτὸν (*De Sent. Dion* 10:5) [Ad]*[83]

==========

[81]Athanasius' citation attests the following variant that is likely the result of itacism:

εχη P^{66*} rell] εχει P^{66c} E Ω f^{13} 579 700 a b e

[82]This γαρ was part of Athanaius' text since it appears in the middle of a long citation. He would have no reason to add it to his citation or change conjunctions to fit his context.

[83]Athanasius shares two readings with Origen and Clement that are given below. Since his adaptation is so loose, these variants were not included in the statisitical analysis.

ερχεται Orig] δυναται ελθειν rell [Lac. Clem]

προς αυτον Clem] προς με e ; αυτον rell

Lac. (P^{75}) P^{45} (Clem) Did

ο πατηρ rell] omit A ; add μου P^{66}

John 6:45 (= Isa. 54:13)

ἔσονται πάντες διδακτοὶ θεοῦ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 59) [C]

Lac. P^{45} Clem Orig Did

διδακτοι rell] add του TR [NA: a b e]

John 6:46

οὐχ ὅτι τὸν πατέρα τις ἑώρακεν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*De Decr.* 21:4) [C]

οὐχ ὅτι τὸν πατέρα τις ἑώρακεν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 22) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) (33) (Clem) (Did)[expl. πατρος]

τις εωρακεν A E Δ Π Ω f^{1} f^{13} 565 700 892 TR] εωρακεν τις P^{75vid} rell [NA: Clem]

θεου Ath^{pt} rell] πατρος ℵ Did (Orig) Ath^{pt} [Lac. Clem]

πατερα^{2} ℵ^{c} rell] θεον ℵ* D a b e [Lac. P^{75} 33 Clem Did]

πατερα^{1} Did^{pt} rell] θεον Did^{pt}

πατερα^{1} rell] add μου Clem

ει μη rell] ειμι 700 [Lac. P^{75}]

παρα rell] εκ f^{1} [Lac. Clem]

του rell] omit B [Lac. Clem]

ουτος rell] αυτος W [Lac. P^{75} Clem Did]

John 6:63

τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 39) [C]

Lac. P^{45} A Clem Orig Did

λελαληκα P^{75vid} (565) rell] λαλω E Δ Ω 579 700 892 TR

ρηματα] add ταυτα e

John 6:67

μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ἀπελθεῖν (*Hist. Arianorum* 67:2) [Ad][84]

Lac. P^{45} A Clem Did

John 6:68

τὰ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Κυρίου ῥήματα ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχει (*Apol. Fuga* 23:19-20) [All]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) A Clem Did

John 7:6

ὁ ἐμὸς καιρὸς οὔπω πάρεστι (*Apol. Fuga* 13:25) [Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} A C Clem Orig Did

ουπω $\aleph^{c}$ rell] ουδεπω W ; ου $\aleph^{*}$

παρεστι rell] παρεστην 1241

==========

[84]The verb ἀπελθεῖν possibly comes from Mt 16:24 (cf. 16:21)

John 7:30

ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν πιάσαι, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπέβαλεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν τὴν χεῖρα, ὅτι οὔπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ (*Apol. Fuga* 13:21-22) [C][85]

Lac. P^{45} A C Clem Did

πιασαι rell] add και εξηλθεν εκ της χειρος αυτων Θ f^{13}

επεβαλεν (b) $Orig^{pt}$ rell] επεβαλλεν P^{66} (b) $Orig^{pt}$; εβαλεν a e

την χειρα rell] τας χειρας W f^{1} 565 a (b) e

ουπω rell] ουδεπω P^{66} [NA: a b e]

εληλυθει rell] εληλυθεν L

John 8:12

ἐγώ εἰμι (φησί) τὸ φῶς (*De Synodis* 49:2) [C][86]

ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 12) [C]

ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 54) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) A C Π Clem

==========

[85]The first three words of this citation εξητουν αυτον πιασαι are found in exactly the same form in Origen (cf. *Io. Com* 19,12,72). The other citation of this verse in Origen reads εζητουν ουν αυτον πιασαι. The agreement of P^{66*} Athanasius and Origen might support a variant found in ℵ (= οι δε εζητουν πιασαι), but since this variant involves an omission of an introductory particle at the beginning of a citation, it is too uncertain to include in the critical apparatus.

[86]This and the following two citations are taken from Jn 8:12 rather than Jn 9:5 because they contain the pronoun εγω which does not appear in Jn 9:5.

ειμι το φως ℵ^{c} rell] φως ειμι ℵ* [Lac. P^{75}]

John 8:35

ὁ δὲ δοῦλος οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· + (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 72) [C][87]

Lac. P^{45} A Π Orig Did

ο δε υιος μενει εις τον αιωνα rell] omit ℵ W 33 1241 Clem[88]

δε^{2} P^{66} D a (b)] omit rell [NA: ℵ W 33 1241 Clem - see omission above][89]

εν τη οικια rell] εις την οικιαν D

οικια rell] add του κυριου a

John 8:36

+ ἐὰν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ, ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 72) [C]

ἐὰν μὴ ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 67) [Ad]

Lac. P^{45} A Π Orig Did

==========

[87]Athanasius' text provides evidence concerning the following two variants. They are probably the result of itacism:

μενει^{1} E^{c} rell] μενη E* Θ (579)(= μεινη)

μενει^{2} rell] μεινη 579

[88]Clement supports this variant because he cites Jn 8:34-36 but omits this clause.

[89]This δε was part of Athanasius' text since it appears in the middle of a long quotation. Athanasius would have little reason to add δε in this place.

ουν rell] omit P^{75} f^{13} 1241 a e ; δε Clem[90]

ελευθερωση ℵ[c] rell] ελευθερωθη ℵ[*91]

ο υιος rell] omit W

εσεσθε rell] εστε P^{66} ; γενησεσθε 1241[92]

υμας rell] ημας 579

John 8:40

τοῦτο Ἀβραάμ οὐκ ἐποίησε (*De Sent. Dion* 3:3) [C]

Lac. P^{45} A Clem Did

John 8:42

εἰ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἦν, ἠγαπᾶτε ἂν ἐμέ· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον (*De Decr.* 21:4) [C]

ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἥκω (*De Synodis* 16:5; quotation from a letter of Arius to Alexander) [C]

Lac. P^{45} A Π (Did)[inc. εγω]

==========

[90]This ουν was part of Athanasius' text because it occurs in the middle of a long quotation. Athanasius would have little reason to add ουν (or change it from δε - see Clem).

[91]Athanasius' citation and adaptation both provide evidence concerning another reading in this variant. This reading could be the result of itacism, but the split in Old Latin witnesses (a b e = *liberaverit*; d = *liverabit*) supports the possibility that this variant is genetically significant.

ελευθερωση ℵ[c] a b e rell] ελευθερωσει D Δ Θ Ω f^{13} 579 d ; ελευθερωθη ℵ[*]

[92]Athanasius' text provides evidence for the following variant. It is probably the result of itacism.

εσεσθε rell] εσεσθαι ℵ D L W Θ f^{13} 579

θεος rell] add o B [NA: a b e; Lac. Did]

υμων rell] ημων ℵ [Lac. Did]

ην rell] omit 579 [Lac. Did]

εγω γαρ εκ rell] εκ γαρ P^{66} ; εγω γαρ παρα 579 ; εγω εκ Did

του πατρος Ath] του θεου rell

εξηλθον rell] εξεληλυθα P^{66}

και ηκω rell] omit e

John 8:44

τὸ μὲν ψεῦδος ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστιν (*Apol. Fuga* 1:11-12) [All]

(ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ τότε Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ νέοι νῦν) παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἑαυτῶν τοῦ διαβόλου (*De Sent. Dion.* 3:3) [All]*[93]

Lac. P^{45} A (Π)

του πατρος rell] omit του 565 892 TR [NA: a b e ; Lac. Π]

πατρος rell] add υμων Clem

John 8:58

πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμι (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 13) [C]

πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμι (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 53) [C]

πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγώ εἰμι. + (*Apol. Fuga* 12:21-23) [C]

==========

[93]This is most likely an allusion to Jn 8:44 because it appears in the context where Athanasius quotes from Jn 8:40. Athanasius states that the Jews of Jesus' time and Jews of the present time both inherited enmity towards Christ from "their father the devil."

Lac. P^{45} Clem Did

γενεσθαι (Δ) rell] omit D a b e

γενεσθαι rell] add γενεσθαι Δ

John 8:59

+ οἱ μὲν Ἰουδαῖοι ἦραν λίθους ἵνα βάλωσιν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο καὶ παρῆγεν οὕτως (*Apol. Fuga* 12:21-23) [C]

Lac. P^{45} Clem (Orig)[inc. λιθους - expl. ιερου] Did

οι μεν Ιουδαιοι (a)] omit rell [Lac. Orig]

ο Θ] omit rell

δε (a) (b) e rell] omit δε B W Orig(?)[94]

και^2... ουτως $\aleph^c$ Θ^c rell] omit P^{66} P^{75} $\aleph^*$ B D W Θ^* a b e UBS^4 Orig(?)[95]

και^2 $\aleph^c$ C L Ψ 33 579 892 1241] omit A E Δ Θ^c Π Ω f^1 f^{13} 565 700 TR

επορευετο $\aleph^c$ C L Ψ 33 579 892 1241] omit A E Δ Θ^c Π Ω f^1 f^{13} 565 700 TR

ηραν] τοτε ηραν D ; ηραν ουν rell [Lac. Orig]

==========

[94]This δε is certainly in Athanasius' text, being found in the middle of an extended citation. In the case of Origen, Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes are uncertain whether δε existed in his text because of the paraphrastic nature of this reference (see Origen, p. 225, fns. 28 and 29). Therefore, Origen is not included in the statistical analysis.

[95]Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes conclude with some uncertainty that Origen's text of John did not contain και - ουτως (see Origen, p. 225, fn 30). The omission is questionable since it appears at the end of a single, rather loose adaptation that does not continue on to the next verse (although it alludes to it).

βαλωσιν επ rell] λιθασωσιν 1241 Orig(?)[96]

εξηλθεν rell] add και 579

John 9:32

ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσθη, ὅτι ἀνέωξέ τις ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλοῦ γεγεννημένου· + (*De Inc.* 38:39-42) [C][97]

Lac. P^{45} C Π Clem Orig Did

ουκ rell] ου L

οφθαλμους τυφλου γεγεννημενου rell] τυφλου γεγεννημενου οφθαλμους 579

γεγεννημενου rell] γεγενημενου A

John 9:33

+ εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδεν (*De Inc.* 38:39-42) [C]

Lac. P^{45} C Π Clem Orig Did

θεου (^{r}D) (a) rell] add ο ανθροπος P^{66} Θ (^{r}1241)

μη ην ουτος παρα θεου rell] μη ουτος παρα Θεου ην D

μη ην rell] μην L

ουτος rell] omit Θ

παρα rell] add του 700 [NA: a b e]

==========

[96]Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes are uncertain whether λιθασωσιν reflects Origen's text (agreeing with 1241) or is due to the influence of Jn. 10:31 (see Origen, p. 225, fn. 28). Therefore, this variant is not included in the statisitical analysis.

[97]Athanasius citation provides evidence for the following variant. This variant is probably the result of itacism.

ανεωξε P^{75} Θ f^{1} 565] ηνεωξε B W Δ^{c}(Δ^{*} εν-) 579 UBS^{4} ; ηνοιξεν (D)(ηνυ-) rell [NA: a b e]

John 9:39

εἰς κρῖμα ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τούτον ἐλήλυθα ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσι καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοί γένωνται (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 55) [C]

Lac. P^{45} C Π Clem

εις τον κοσμον τουτον εληλυθα/ηλθον rell] ηλθον εις τον κοσμον τουτον P^{66c} D a b ; ηλθον εις τον κοσμον P^{66*} Did ; εις τον κοσμον ηλθον 1241

εληλυθα P^{75} 579 892] ηλθον rell

εις κριμα εγω rell] εγω εις κριμα D

κριμα rell] κρισιν Δ

οι μη βλεποντες βλεπωσι και rell] omit 1241

βλεπωσι και οι βλεποντες rell] omit 579

γενωνται rell] γενησονται f^{13}

John 10:9 (cf. Jn 10:7)

ἐγὼ εἰμι (ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ) ἡ θύρα, καὶ δι᾽ ἐμοῦ δεῖ πάντας εἰσελθεῖν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 61) [Ad]

Lac. C 892 Clem (Orig)[expl. θυρα]

John 10:15

καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα (*Dep. Arii = De Decr.* 35:15) [C]

(ὁ λόγος) ὁ γινώσκων τὸν πατέρα (*De Decr.* 27:2; quotation from Origen) [All]

Lac. C 892 Clem Orig Did

John 10:30

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*De Decr.* 16:2) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*De Decr.* 21:4) [C]

ἐγὼ γὰρ [φησί] καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*De Decr.* 26:7; found in a quotation from a letter of Dionysius of Rome against the Sabellians) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*De Decr.* 31:2) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Dep. Arii* = *De Decr.* 35:14) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*De Sent. Dion.* 2:4) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*De Sent. Dion.* 26:1) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*De Sent. Dion.* 26:1) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*De Synodis* 45:4) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*De Synodis* 48:3) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*De Synodis* 48:4) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 4) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 34) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 33) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἓν ἐσμεν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 54) [C]

καὶ ἓν μέν εἰσιν αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ πατήρ (*De Decr.* 20:5) [All]

καὶ οὕτως ἓν αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ πατήρ εἰσιν (*De Decr.* 24:4) [All]

διὸ καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν εἰσι (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 16) [All]

Lac. P^{45} C 892

πατηρ Did^{pt} rell] add μου W Δ e Did^{pt}

John 10:33

διᾰ τί σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὢν ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν θεόν; (*De Decr.* 1:4) [C]

διὰ τί σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὢν ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν θεόν; (*De Synodis* 50:2) [C]

διὰ τί σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὢν ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν θεὸν; (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 4) [C]

Lac. (P^{75}) C 892 Clem (Orig)[inc. συ] (Did)[inc. συ]

συ rell] omit D Π 1241 e [Lac. P^{75}]

σεαυτον rell] εαυτον f^{13} 1241

σεαυτον P^{66c} rell] add τον P^{66} [Lac. P^{75}]

John 10:35

εἰ ἐκείνους θεοὺς εἶπε πρὸς οὕς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 39) [C]

εἰ ἐκείνους θεοὺς εἶπε πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή + (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 15) [C]

Lac. C 892 Clem Orig (Did)[expl. εγενετο]

θεους ειπε Did] ειπε θεους rell

του θεου εγενετο rell] εγενετο του θεου D a b e

λυθηναι η γραφη rell] λυθηναι P^{45} e [Lac. Did]

προς ους ο λογος του θεου εγενετο rell] omit P^{45}

λυθηναι rell] αυθηναι 579

John 10:36

+ ὅν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασε καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς· ὅτι εἶπον, υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 15) [C]

Lac. (P^{75}) C 892 Clem

βλασφημεις rell] βλασφημει a b e Did [Lac. 1241]

του P^{45vid} P^{66c} rell] omit P^{66*} ℵ D E W [NA: a b e ; Lac. P^{75}]

ηγιασε και rell] omit 579

υμεις rell] υμιν Did [Lac. P^{75}]

υμεις λεγετε οτι βλασφημεις (579) rell] τουτο υμεις ου πιστευετε 1241

ειπον rell] add o P^{45} [Lac. P^{75}]

John 10:37

εἰ οὐ ποιῶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρός μου, μὴ πιστεύητέ μοι· + (*De Inc.* 18:12-15) [C]

Lac. (P^{75}) C 892 Clem Orig Did

ει ου P^{66c} rell] ει μη f^{13} (Θ); ει μου η Θ ; ει ουν P^{66*} [NA: a b e; Lac. P^{75}]

John 10:38

+ εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις μου πιστεύσατε· ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε, ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί. (*De Inc.* 18:12-15) [C]

κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις μου πιστεύετε, ἵνα γνῶτε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 12) [Ad]*

TEXT:

εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις μου (πιστεύσατε/ πιστεύετε) ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε, ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί.[98]

==========

[98]Athanasius' text most likely contained και γινωσκητε.

Lac. (P^{75}) C 892 Clem Orig Did

πιστευητε P^{45} P^{66c} P^{75} B L Π Ψ Ω 700 TR UBS^4]
πιστευετε ℵ A E W Δ Θ f^1 f^{13} 33 565 579 1241 ;
πιστευσηται P^{66*} ; θελετε πιστευειν D a b [NA:
e - see omission below]

μου f^{13} 579 (1241)] omit rell [Lac. P^{75}]

πιστευσατε P^{45} P^{66} A E Ψ Ω f^{13} 565 700 TR Ath^{pt}]
πιστευετε P^{75} ℵ B D L W Θ Π f^1 33 579 1241 a b e
UBS^4 Ath^{pt} ; πιστευσετε Δ

και γινωσκητε P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} B L (W) Θ f^1 33 565 UBS^4]
και πιστευσητε A E^c Δ Π Ψ Ω f^{13} 700 TR ; και
πιστευετε (ℵ) 579 1241 ; omit D (E^*) a b e

τω πατρι P^{66} P^{75} ℵ B D L W 33 1241 a e UBS^4] αυτω rell

---

ει... πιστευητε rell] omit e

μη rell] ου f^{13} [NA: a b]

ινα γνωτε rell] αναγνωτε W

ινα γνωτε και γινωσκητε/πιστευσητε/-ετε E^c rell]
omit E^*

και rell] omit P^{66}

John 11:34

καὶ ἐπυνθάνετο τοῦ Λάζαρος κεῖται (*De Decr.* 14:3) [All]

Lac. (P^{75}) 565 892 Clem Orig Did

John 11:47

τί ποιοῦμεν, ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος πολλὰ ποιεῖ σημεῖα; (*De Decr.* 1:4) [C]

==========

The citation in *De Incarnatione* contains it. The adaptation in *Oratio II contra Arianos*, while being very close in wording through the first half of the citation, becomes much looser towards the end, where και γινωσκητε is omitted. The weight of this adaptation is not as strong as the citation.

Lac. P^{75} C 565 892 Clem Did

ποιουμεν P^{45c} rell] ποιωμεν Ω 33 579 ; ποιησομεν P^{45*} a b e

οτι rell] omit P^{45} D

ουτος ο ανθρωπος rell] ο ανθρωπος ουτος 33 1241

πολλα rell] τοιαυτα D b e

ποιει σημεια P^{45vid} P^{66} ℵ A B L W Θ Ψ 33 579 UBS^4 Orig] σημεια ποιει D E Δ Π Ω f^1 f^{13} 700 1241 a b e TR

τι rell] add ουν Δ

ποιουμεν rell] add αυτον 579

John 11:53

ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνης, (φησί), τῆς ἡμέρας ἐβουλεύσαντο, ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν. + (*Apol. Fuga* 12:17-20) [C]

Lac. C 892 Clem Did

ημερας P^{75vid} rell] ωρας L 1241

εβουλευσαντο P^{45} P^{66} P^{75vid} ℵ B D W Θ f^{13} UBS^4] συνεβουλευσαντο rell [NA: a b e]

εβουλευσαντο rell] add οι ᾽Ιουδαιοι 1241 e

αποκτεινωσιν rell] αποκτεινουσιν f^1

John 11:54

+ ῾ο οὖν ᾽Ιησοῦς οὐκέτι παρρησίᾳ περιεπάτει ἐν τοῖς ᾽Ιουδαίοις, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὴν χώραν ἐγγὺς τῆς ἐρήμου (*Apol. Fuga* 12:17-20) [C]

Lac. (P^{45}) C 892 Clem Did

ο ουν Ιησους P^{75vid} ℵ B L W (Θ) f^{1} 565 579 1241 UBS^{4} Orig] Ιησους ουν A D E Δ Π Ψ Ω f^{13} 33 700 TR ; ο δε Ιησους P^{66} [NA: a b e; Lac. P^{45}]

εκειθεν rell] omit P^{45vid} D 579 a b e

την P^{45vid} P^{75vid} rell] omit Θ f^{1} 565 [NA: a b e]

χωραν rell] add Σαμφουριν D

John 12:13

λάβωμεν τὰ βάϊα τῶν φοινίκων (καὶ νικηταὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας γενόμενοι, ὡς) οἱ ἀπαντήσαντες τῷ σωτῆρι (*Ep. Festales XXVIII* in *Cosmam Indicopleustam*) [All]*

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) C 892 (Clem) Did

απαντησιν A Π Orig] ; συναντησιν D L f^{13} 1241 ; υπαντησιν rell [NA: a b e]

John 12:32

ὅταν ὑψωθῶ, πάντας ἑλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαυτόν (*De Inc.* 25:16-17) [Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} (P^{75}) C Clem Did

οταν 1241 a e] εαν rell ; αν B

παντας P^{75vid} ℵ^{c} rell] παντα P^{66} ℵ* D a b e [Lac. P^{75}]

παντας ελκυσω (Θ) rell] ελκυσω παντα D

John 12:34

ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ Χριστὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· καὶ πῶς σὺ λέγεις ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν ὑψωθηναι; (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 15) [Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} C Clem Orig Did

μενει εις τον αιωνα rell] εις των αιωνα μενει Θ f^{13}
συ λεγεις rell] λεγεις συ P^{75} B L W Π 579 UBS^4
οτι^2 rell] omit P^{75} E Δ Ω 700

πως $Δ^c$ rell] omit 1241 ; προς $Δ^*$

John 12:46

ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 54) [C]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem Orig Did

κοσμον rell] add τουτον 579 a b e
πας P^{66c} rell] omit P^{66*} B

John 13:13

οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετέ με, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος; καὶ καλῶς λέγετε, εἰμὶ γὰρ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 12) [C]

οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετέ με, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος; και καλῶς λέγετε, εἰμὶ γὰρ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 23) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} 565 Clem

ο κυριος και ο διδασκαλος C^c E_* f^{13} 33 892 1241 Did] ο διδασκαλος και ο κυριος C^* rell

---

ουχ υμεις λεγετε] υμεις φωνειτε rell

John 14:3

ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθε (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 66) [C]

ὅπου αὐτὸς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσόμεθα (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 69) [All]*

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} Clem Orig Did

ειμι εγω rell] εγω ειμι W
ειμι εγω rell] add εκει Π
υμεις rell] add εκει f^{13}
εσεσθε] εσθε D ; ητε rell

John 14:6

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Apol. Const.* 12:6) [C]

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Apol. Const.* 19:24-25) [C]

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 12) [C]

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 20) [C]

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 36) [C]

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 20) [C]

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 54) [C]

ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 65) [C]

ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς (καὶ ἡ θύρα) (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 61) [Ad]

ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς (καὶ ἡ θύρα) (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 64) [Ad]

(καὶ αὐτοζωή, καὶ θύρα, καὶ ποιμήν, καὶ) ὁδός, (καὶ βασιλεύς, καὶ ἡγεμών, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι σωτήρ, καὶ ζωοποιός, καὶ φῶς, καὶ πρόνοια τῶν πάντων) (*CG* 47:4-6) [All]

(τὸν δὲ ἀληθῶς υἱὸν κατ᾽ ἐπίνοιαν μόνον λέγεσθαι λόγον ὡς ἄμπελόν καὶ) ὁδὸν (καὶ θύραν καὶ ξύλον ζωῆς) (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 37) [All]

TEXT:

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} (Clem)

John 14:8 (cf. Jn 14:9)

δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 12) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C (Clem) Did

John 14:9

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα μου (*CG* 45:11) [C]

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*De Decr.* 12:3) [C]

ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμέ ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*De Decr.* 31:2) [C]

ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Dep. Arii = De Decr.* 35:13) [C]

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*De Sent. Dion* 10:1) [C]

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*De Sent. Dion* 26:1) [C]

ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*De Synodis* 45:4) [C]

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*De Synodis* 48:3) [C]

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 9) [C]

ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 12) [C]

ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 34) [C]

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 61) [C]

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 17) [C]

ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ, ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 54) [C]

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς, ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 80) [C]

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς, ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 82) [C]

ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*De Decr.* 16:2) [All]

ὁ τὸν υἱὸν ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*De Synodis* 38:3) [Ad]

ὁ τὸν υἱὸν ἑωρακὼς ἴδῃ τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 21) [All]

ὁ ἑωρακὼς τὸν υἱὸν ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 35) [Ad]

καὶ ὁ ἑωρακὼς αὐτὸν ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 22) [Ad]

TEXT:

ὁ (ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς/ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ) ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα

Lac. P^{45} C Clem

εμε εωρακως a e Did^{pt} Ath^{pt}] εωρακως εμε P^{75vid} Did^{pt} Ath^{pt} rell

εωρακε (e) rell] add και P^{75} a b

John 14:10 (first half of verse = John 14:11a)

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*CG* 47:11) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*De Decr.* 21:4) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*De Decr.* 26:7; found in a quotation from Dionysius, Bishop of Rome) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*De Decr.* 31:2) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Dep. Arii = De Decr.* 35:14) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*De Sent. Dion.* 2:4) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*De Sent. Dion.* 10:1) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστι (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 34) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστι (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 61) [C]

κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἐστι καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 33) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 54) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 56) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 82) [C]

ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων τὰ ἔργα ποιεῖ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 61) [C]**

ὁ πατὴρ ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοὶ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα (ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ) (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 33) [Ad]*[99]

τὸν γὰρ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ὄντα ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐστι (*De Decr.* 16:2) [All]

εἴ γε ἐν τῷ πατρί ἐστιν (*De Decr.* 26:4; found in a quotation from Dionysius, Bishop of Rome) [All]

ὁ υἱὸς ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 61) [All]

ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἐστι καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν αὐτῷ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 22) [All]

τὸν ὄντα ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐστιν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 43) [All]

TEXT:

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί εστιν... ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα

Lac. P^{45} (33) C Clem Orig

εν εμοι μενων P^{66} P^{75} B L Ψ b e UBS^4] ο εν εμοι μενων (Did) rell

==========

[99]The last three words of this adaptation, α εγω ποιω, most likely represent a conflation with Jn 14:12.

αυτος ποιει τα εργα rell] ποιει τα εργα αυτος P^{75} L W 33 579 ; ποιει τα εργα αυτου P^{66} ℵ B D UBS^{4} Did ; ποιει τα εργα e ; αυτος λαλει και εργα α ποιω αυτος ποιει a b

John 14:16 (cf. 15:26 and 16:7)

καὶ παρακαλέσω τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον πέμψει ὑμῖν (*De Synodis* 8.6; quotation from the 3rd Sirmian Confession [359 CE]) [Ad][100]

καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον πέμψει ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ὃν ἐρωτήσω ἐγώ (*De Synodis* 27.3.21) [Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} C (33) Clem Orig Did

αλλον P^{66c} rell] αλλα P^{66*}

ερωτησω ℵ^{c} rell] τηρησω ℵ*

John 14:17 (= Jn 15:26, Jn 16:13)

τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (*De Synodis* 8:6; quotation from the 3rd Sirmian Confession [359 CE]) [All]

Lac. P^{45} C Clem Orig Did

το D^{c} rell] τον Δ ; add το D*

John 14:23

ἐλευσόμεθα ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ μονὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 42) [Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} C 892 Clem

==========

[100]The verb πεμψει in this and the following adaptation is possibly taken from Jn 14:26 (cf. Jn 15:26 and 16:7).

ελευσομεθα P^{66c} rell] ελευσομαι D e ; εισελευσομεθα P^{66*}

εγω και ο πατηρ Did] omit rell

ποιησομεν A E (Δ) Θ Π Ψ (Ω) 700 1241 (a b) TR] ποιησομεθα (a b) rell ; ποιησομαι D e

---

μονην παρ αυτω rell] προς αυτον μονην D

John 14:26

(τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ἐκεῖνος ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται) καὶ διδάξει καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα (*De Synodis* 8:6; quotation from the 3rd Sirmian Confession [359 CE]) [Ad]*[101]

Lac. P^{45} C W 892 Clem Did

και υπομνησει υμας παντα P^{75vid} rell] omit 1241 b

John 14:28

εἰ ἠγαπᾶτέ με, ἐχάρητε ἂν, ὅτι εἶπον· πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ μείζων μοῦ ἐστι· + (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 13) [C]

ὁ ἐμὲ πέμψας πατὴρ μείζων μού ἐστι (*De Synodis* 28:7; quotation from the 2nd Council of Sirmius [357 CE]) [Ad]

ἀπέρχομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου (*De Synodis* 8.6; quotation from the 3rd Sirmian Confession [359 CE]) [Ad]*

(διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ εἴρηκεν) ὁ πατὴρ μου κρείττων μοῦ ἐστιν... (ἀλλὰ) μείζων (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 58) [All]

Lac. P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} C W 892 Clem Did

==========

[101]Athanasius' adaptation might support the following variant reading, but the adaptation is too loose to confirm the absence of παντα.

διδαξει a Ath(?)] διδαξει παντα rell

ηγαπατε rell] αγαπατε D L f^{13} 33 579 [NA: a b e]

οτι ειπον E Δ Ω 700 TR] οτι rell ; οτι εγω f^{13} e

πατηρ $\aleph^{c}$ A B D^{*} L Ψ f^{1} 33 565 b e UBS^{4} Orig] add μου $\aleph^{*}$ D^{c} E Δ Θ Π Ω f^{13} 579 700 1241 a TR

πορευομαι rell] απερχομαι 579 Ath^{pt}(?)[102]

πατερα rell] add μου f^{13} Ath^{pt}(?)

πατηρ rell] add ο πεμψας με Orig(?)[103]

John 14:29

+ καὶ νῦν προείρηκα ὑμῖν, πρὶν γενέσθαι, ἵνα ὅταν γένηται, πιστεύσητε (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 13) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66})[inc. υμιν (frag.)] P^{75} C W 892 Clem Orig Did

οταν rell] εαν L 579 [Lac. P^{66}]

προειρηκα] ειρηκα rell [NA: a b e; Lac. P^{66}]

πριν P^{66} rell] προ του f^{13}

==========

[102]The adaptation from *De Synodis* 8.6 provides support for this and the following variant reading. Unfortunately, it is not certain whether the adaptation comes from Jn 14:12 or Jn 14:28, although 14:28 seems more likely. The adaptation is located in a conflation of verses starting with verse 14:12, then 14:16, 14:17, 16:14, and finally 14:26. A collation of Jn 14:12 revealed the following:

Lac. P^{45} C (33) Clem Orig Did

απερχομαι Ath] πορευσομαι P^{75} ; πορευομαι rell

πατερα μου E Δ Ψ Ω f^{13} (33^{vid}) 565 700 892 1241 e TR] πατερα rell

[103]Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes do not consider this to be a part of Origen's text, attributing it to a mental conflation or harmonization (see Origen, p. 303, fn. 5).

John 14:30

ἔρχεται ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου καὶ ⸂ἐν ἐμοί εὑρίσκει οὐδέν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 69) [C][104]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66})(...]χεται γαρ ο του[...) P^{75} C W 892 Clem Did

ο αρχων του κοσμου (τουτου) f^{1} f^{13} 565 579 e Orig] ο του κοσμου (τουτου) αρχων P^{66vid} 33^{vid} rell

τουτου Ψ f^{1} f^{13} 565 579 a b e TR Orig] omit 33^{vid} rell [Lac. P^{66}]

ευρισκει ουδεν $Orig^{pt}$] ευρησει ουδεν Ⲏ $Orig^{pt}$; ουκ εχει ουδεν (e) $Orig^{pt}$ rell [Lac. P^{66}]

John 15:1 (cf. Jn 15:5)

ἐγὼ ἡ ἄμπελος, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ γεωργὸς (*De Sent. Dion.* 10:1) [Ad]*

(ἐγὼ ἡ ἄμπελος, ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα,) καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ γεωργὸς (*De Sent. Dion.* 10:4) [Ad]*[105]

ἐστιν ὁ γεωργὸς πρὸς τὴν ἄμπελον (*De Sent. Dion.* 4:2; found in a quotation from a letter of Dionysius) [All]

γράφων ἐμνήσθην τοῦ γεωργοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀμπέλου (*De Sent. Dion.* 12:2) [All]

==========

[104]Athanasius' citation ends with ουδεν. This might provide evidence for the following variant, but since it occurs at the end of the verse, it is not certain.

ουδεν rell] add ευρειν D a [Lac. P^{66}]

[105]This adaptation is most likely a conflation of Jn 15:1 and 15:5 (although it does agree closely with the wording found in minuscule ms 28). Since both of these verses contain εγω η αμπελος, it is unclear from which verse the first clause in this reference is taken. Since it is immediately followed by υμεις τα κληματα which only occurs in Jn 15:5, the first two clauses might have been taken from there. In any case, since no textual variant exists for εγω η αμπελος in either verse, the precise identification of its source is not crucial.

γραψάτωσαν τὴν ἄμπελον καὶ τὸν γεωργὸν (*De Sent. Dion.* 24:2) [All]

ἀνάγκη γὰρ καὶ ἀμπέλου λεγομένου τοῦ κυρίου εἶναι καὶ γεωργὸν... καὶ ἄλλος ἡ ἄμπελος καὶ ἄλλος ὁ γεωργός (*De Sent. Dion.* 26:1 2) [All]

Lac. P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} C W 892 (Did)

ο γεωργος rell] γεωργος D Δ [NA: a b e; Lac. Did]

John 15:5

ἐγὼ ἡ ἄμπελος, ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα, (καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ γεωργὸς) (*De Sent. Dion.* 10:4) [Ad]*[106]

αὐτὸς ἡ ἄμπελος, ἡμεῖς τὰ κλήματα (*De Sent. Dion* 10:3) [Ad]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C W 892 (Clem)

η rell] omit Orig

John 15:20

εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς διώξουσιν (*De Sent. Dion.* 24:1) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66})(inc. [εδι]ωξαν) P^{75} C 892 Clem Orig Did

John 16:7

ἐγὼ αὐτὸ ἀποστέλλω (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 47) [All][107]

==========

[106]See preceding footnote for Jn 15:1.

[107]This allusion is found between quotations from Jn. 16:14 and Jn 20:22. The αυτο refers to the πνευμα αγιος stated in the context.

ἐγὼ αὐτὸ ἀποστέλλω (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50) [All][108]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C 892 Clem Orig Did

John 16:13

ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50) [C]

οὐ γὰρ ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ (φησὶ) τὸ πνεῦμα λαλεῖ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 47) [Ad]*

Lac. P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} C 892 Clem (Did)[expl. λαλει]

οσα ℵ B D^{*} L W Ψ f^{1} 579 b e UBS^{4} Orig] add εαν A Π 565 (a) ; add αν D^{c} (Δ) (a) rell [Lac. Did]

ακουσει B D E W Θ Ψ f^{1} 579 UBS^{4} Orig] ακουει ℵ L 33 b e ; ακουση rell [Lac. Did]

John 16:14 (cf. Jn 16:15)

κἀκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50) [C]

(τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,) ἐκεῖνος ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται (*De Synodis* 8:6; quotation from the 3rd Sirmian Confession [359 CE]) [Ad]*

τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 47) [Ad]*

καὶ μὴν αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα μᾶλλον παρὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ λαμβάνει, (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 15; cf. verb in Jn 16:15) [All]

TEXT:

ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει... ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται

Lac. P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} C 892 Clem (Orig)[inc. εκ] Did

εκεινος... ληψεται rell] omit (entire verse) 579 1241

==========

[108]This allusion follows a quote from Jn 20:22, which mentions the πνευμα αγιον.

ληψεται rell] λαμβανει f^{13} e [NA: 579 1241 - see omission above]

εμε rell] με Ω [NA: a b e; Lac. Orig]

John 16:15

πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμά ἐστι (*De Synodis* 49:2) [C][109]

πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμά ἐστι (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 61) [C]

πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμὰ ἐστιν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 24) [C]

πάντα γὰρ, ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατήρ, τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐστιν (*De Decretis* 30:2) [All]

ὅμοιος ὢν κατὰ πάντα τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πάντα ὅσα τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχων (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 18) [All]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C 892 Clem Orig Did

παντα... εστιν $\aleph^{c}$ rell] omit (entire verse) P^{66} $\aleph^{*}$

John 16:25

ταῦτα ἐν παροιμίαις λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἀλλ᾽ ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὐκέτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ὑμῖν ἀλλὰ παῤῥησίᾳ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 44) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66}) P^{75} 892 Clem (Orig)[expl. υμιν^{2}] Did

αλλ᾽ A C^{c} D^{c} E Δ Θ Π^{*} Ψ Ω f^{13} 565 700 1241 TR] omit P^{66vid} $\aleph$ B C D^{*} L W Π^{c} f^{1} 33 579 a b e UBS^{4} Orig

αλλα^{2} rell] add εν D 579 [Lac. Orig]

---

[109]Athanasius' citations give evidence for the following variant. It is probably a result of itacism.

εχει rell] εχη E

λελαληκα P^{66vid} rell] λαλησω Δ

οτε P^{66} ℵ^{c} rell] οτι E ; οπου ℵ* ; omit f^{1}

John 17:1

πάτερ, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα· δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱόν (*Apol. Fuga* 15:23-24) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} 565 892 (Clem) Did

John 17:3

(δὸς αὐτοῖς) ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 81) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66}) P^{75} 565 892 Clem

γινωσκωσιν rell] γινωσκουσιν A D L W Δ 33 579 1241 Did [NA: a b e; Lac. P^{66}]

μονον αληθινον P^{66} rell] μονον και αληθινον b e

σε rell] omit W

απεστειλας rell] απεστειλεν W ; [απε]πεμψας P^{66vid}

John 17:4

ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· τὸ ἔργον ἐτελείωσα, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 66) [C][110]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} 565 892 Clem Orig Did

ετελειωσα D E Δ Θ Ψ Ω f^{13} 700 1241 e TR] τελειωσας P^{66vid} rell ; omit a

==========

[110]Athanasius' citation ends with ποιησω. This might support the following variant, but since it occurs at the end of his citation, it is uncertain.

ποιησω rell] add αυτο 700 1241 ; add ετελειωσα αυτο a

δεδωκας rell] εδωκας C D W Π [NA: a b e; Lac. P^{66}]

σε rell] δε 579

γης rell] add και D

εργον rell] add σου W ; add μονον b

μοι $\aleph^{c}$ rell] με $\aleph^{*}$

John 17:5

δόξασόν με σὺ, πάτερ, τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 38) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} 565 892 Clem Did

η $\aleph^{c}$ rell] ην $\aleph^{*}$ 579 [Lac. P^{66}]

προ του τον κοσμον ειναι παρα σοι $Orig^{pt}$ rell] παρα σοι προ του τον κοσμον ειναι P^{66*} a $Orig^{pt}$; παρα σοι προ του γενεσθαι τον κοσμον D

σου rell] omit Orig

πατερ D^{c} rell] πατηρ D^{*} [NA: a b e]

πατερ] add παρα σεαυτω rell

John 17:10

πάντα τὰ ἐμὰ σά ἐστι καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμά (*De Synodis* 49:2) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} 565 892 Clem (Orig)[expl. εστιν] Did

παντα τα εμα Orig] τα εμα παντα P^{66vid} rell [NA: ℵ - see substitution below]

παντα τα εμα... τα σα εμα rell] εμοι αυτους εδωκας ℵ

John 17:17

ὁ δὲ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 46) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} 892 Clem Orig Did

αληθεια ℵ^{c} rell] η αληθεια B W 579 [NA: ℵ* - see omission below; a b e]

---

o... αληθεια ℵ^{c} rell] omit ℵ*

John 17:18

ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον + (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 46) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} 892 Clem Orig Did

εις rell] add τουτον D a b [NA: P^{66} - see omission below]

εγω... κοσμον rell] omit P^{66}

απεστειλα rell] αποστελλω f^{13}

John 17:19

+ καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτὸν, ἵνα ὦσι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 46) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} 892 (Clem) Orig Did

εγω rell] omit ℵ A W 579 700 b e [Lac. P^{66} Clem]

ωσι και αυτοι P^{66c} C^{*} rell] και αυτοι ωσιν C^{c} E Δ Ω 700 TR ; ωσιν αυτοι P^{66*} a b e [Lac. Clem]

John 17:21

ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐγὼ καὶ σὺ ἕν ἐσμεν, κἀκεῖνοι ἕν ὦσιν ἐν ἡμῖν
(*Oratio II contra Arianos* 42) [Ad]*[111]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} 892

ινα ωσπερ εγω και συ εν εσμεν Did] καθως συ πατερ εν εμοι καγω εν σοι rell [Lac. Orig.]

εν ωσιν C^{c} rell] ωσιν P^{66vid} B C^{*} D W a b e UBS^{4}

κακεινοι] ινα και αυτοι (Did) (= ουτοι)[112]

John 17:22

κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν, ἣν δέδωκάς μοι, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν,
καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 48) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} 892 Orig Did

καγω C^{*} (a b e) rell] και εγω A C^{c} E Δ Θ Π f^{13} 700 1241 (a b e) TR ; εγω 579

δεδωκας P^{66vid} W^{*} rell] εδωκας A D W^{c} Θ Π Ψ 579 Clem [NA: a b e]

δεδωκα rell] εδωκα ℵ A Θ Π f^{13} [NA: a b e]

καθως rell] add και a b e

==========

[111]This adaptation has greater verbal affinity to Jn 17:21 than to Jn 17:11 or Jn 17:22-23, especially εν ωσιν εν ημιν (the word order is transposed in Athanasius). The first part of the adaptation is difficult to identify. It sounds very Johannine, but there are no texts in John where Jesus makes the statement ινα ωσπερ εγω και συ εν εσμεν. The closest texts are Jn 17:21 - καθως συ πατερ εν εμοι καγω εν σοι and 17:22 - ινα ωσιν εν καθως ημεις εν (+ εσμεν in some witnesses). As noted in the apparatus, Didymus cites the beginning portion of the verse in exactly the same form as Athanasius in three separate places.

[112]κακεινοι could represent a conflation from Jn 17:24 where Jesus states κακεινοι ωσιν μετ᾽ εμου.

εν εσμεν ℵ^{c} C^{c} rell] εν P^{66} B C* D L W f^{1} 33 e UBS^{4} Clem ; omit ℵ* 579

δοξαν rell] add μου W

ωσιν rell] add το D [NA: a b e]

John 18:4

τίνα ζητεῖτε; + (*Apol. Fuga* 15:26-28) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} 892 Clem

John 18:5

+ τῶν δὲ ἀποκριναμένων· Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον. ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ἐγώ εἰμι ὃν ζητεῖτε (*Apol. Fuga* 15:26-28) [Ad]*[n3]

(ὁ σωτὴρ... καὶ ζητούμενος εἶπεν) ἐγώ εἰμι (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 68) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66}) P^{75} 892 Clem (Did)

αυτοις B D a b e UBS^{4} Orig] add Ιησους ℵ ; add o Ιησους rell [Lac. P^{66} Did]

ειμι rell] add Ιησους B (a) [Lac. P^{66} Did]

John 18:23

τί με δέρεις; (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 6) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} D 892 e Clem Orig Did

==========

[113]This adaptation attests a variant spelling of "Nazareth."

Ναζωραιον rell] Ναζαρηνον D a Did [Lac. P^{66}]

John 18:37

ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 54) [C][114]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66}) P^{75} C D 892 Clem Orig Did

τη αληθεια ℵ^{c} rell] περι της αληθειας ℵ* (e)

εγω rell] omit e

τουτο[1] rell] add και A [Lac. P^{66}]

μαρτυρησω P^{66vid} ℵ^{c} rell] μαρτυρηση ℵ*

John 19:15

οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλέα εἰ μὴ Καίσαρα (*Hist. Arianorum* 32:4) [C][115]

οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλέα εἰ μὴ Καίσαρα (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 8) [C]

οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλέα εἰ μὴ Καίσαρα (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 42) [C]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66}) P^{75} C D 892 Clem

John 19:34

Πιλᾶτος μὲν οὖν, καθηκεύων τοῖς τότε Ἰουδαίοις, λόγχῃ μίαν πλευρὰν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἔνυξεν (*Apol. Const.* 33) [All]*

==========

[114]Athanasius' citation provides evidence for the following variant concerning spelling:

γεγεννημαι rell] γεγενημαι W Ω 700 [NA: a b e; Lac. P^{66}]

[115]These citations attest the following variant. It is most likely the result of itacism or similar sounding words.

εχομεν rell] εχωμεν E 579 700 [Lac. P^{66}]

τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἔπασχε μὲν νυττόμενον ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ καὶ ἔρρεεν ἐκ τῆς τούτου πλευρᾶς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 10) [All]*

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66}) P^{75} C D 892 Clem Did

αιμα και υδωρ rell] υδωρ και αιμα 579 e

λογχη rell] λογχην 579 [Lac. P^{66}]

ενυξεν P^{66} rell] ηνοιξεν 579

John 19:39

(παρὰ δὲ) Νικοδημαι... (δείκναματι ὁ μὲν) ἦλθε φέρων μίγμα σμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης λίτρας ἑκατὸν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 47) [Ad]*[116]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66}) P^{75} C D 892 Clem Orig Did

φερων P^{66vid} $\aleph^{c}$ (f^{13}) rell] εχων $\aleph^{*}$ W [NA: 579 - see omission below]

μιγμα P^{66vid} $\aleph^{c}$ (Ψ) rell] ελιγμα $\aleph^{*}$ B W ; μελιγμα e ; σμιγμα Ψ [NA: 579 - see omission below]

ηλθεν (v. 38)... Ιησου (v. 40) rell] omit 579

εκατον rell] omit Θ

John 20:17

πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεόν ὑμῶν (*De Synodis* 28:4; quotation from confession of 2nd Council of Sirmius [357 CE]) [C]

==========

[116]This adaptation attests the following variation in spelling:

σμυρνης rell] ζμυρνης W ; σζμυρνης $\aleph$ [NA: a b e; Lac. P^{66}]

Lac. P^{45} P^{75} C 579 892 Clem Did

πορευομαι $Orig^{pt}$] αναβαινω P^{66vid} 33^{vid} $Orig^{pt}$ rell

John 20:19

καὶ γὰρ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀνεχώρουν κρυπτόμενοι (*Apol. Fuga* 11) [All]*[117]

Πέτρος δὲ ὁ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων κρυπτόμενος (*Apol. Fuga* 18) [All]

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66}) P^{75} C (33) 579 892 Clem Orig Did

John 20:22

λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 47) [C]

λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 48) [C]

λάβετε τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50) [C]

Lac. P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} C 579 892 Did

==========

[117]This allusion to the disciples hiding for "fear of the Jews" might attest the following textual variant:

οι μαθηται ℵ* A B D W a UBS^4] add συνηγμενοι ℵ^c E Θ Ω f^1 f^{13} 565 700 1241 b e TR ; add αυτου συνηγμενοι L Δ Π Ψ 33 [Lac. P^{66}]

The context of the allusion and the lack of an introductory formula makes it appear that Athanasius is not explicitly referring to this or any other passage of scripture. Therefore, the absence of συνηγμενοι is probably due to coincidence rather than to the wording of his NT text.

The presence of the verb κρυπτω in this and the following allusion may be the result of a conflation with Jn 19:38, which speaks of Joseph of Arimathea "who was a disciple of Jesus, but secretly, for fear of the Jews" (ων μαθητης του Ιησου κεκρυμμεντος δε δια τον φοβον Ιουδαιων).

John 20:25

καὶ τοῦτο Θωμᾶς ἀναστὰν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐψηλάφησε καὶ εἶδεν ἐν αὐτῷ τοὺς τύπους τῶν ἥλων (*Ep. ad Epictetem* 6) [All]*[118]

μάλιστα δὲ τῷ Θωμᾷ, ὃς μετὰ τὸ ἰδεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τοὺς τῶν ἥλων τόπους (ἀνεβόησεν, ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου) (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 10) [All]*

Lac. P^{45} (P^{66}) P^{75} C (33) 579 892 Clem (Orig) Did

τους τυπους P^{66vid} 565] τον τυπον rell [Lac. 33 Orig]

John 20:28

(μάλιστα δὲ τῷ Θωμᾷ, ὃς μετὰ τὸ ἰδεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ τοὺς τῶν ἥλων τόπους ἀνεβόησεν,) ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 10) [C]

ὁ κύριος μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 23)

Lac. P^{45} P^{66} P^{75} 579 892 Clem Orig Did

---

o^2 rell] omit D [NA: a b e]

==========

[118]The verb εψηλαφησε could be a conflation with Lk 24:39.

CHAPTER 5

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Methods of Analysis

In order to analyze the textual character of Athanasius' text of the Gospels, this study will utilize two methods - a quantitative analysis (which will be accomplished in this chapter) and a group profile analysis (which will be addressed in the following chapter).[1] These analyses will provide a clearer picture of the relationship of Athanasius' text of the Gospels to other NT textual witnesses on an individual basis. They also will demonstrate the extent to which he preserves characteristic readings of each of the textual groups.[2]

---

[1]For an excellent overview of the history of textual analysis and recent methodological developments for analyzing and classifying NT textual witnesses, see Bart D. Ehrman, "Methodological Developments in the Analysis and Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence," *NovT* 29 (1987): 22-45.

[2]The analysis of Athanasius' text which follows is patterned on the process developed by Bart Ehrman in his work Didymus the Blind and His Text of the Gospels, SBLNTGF 1 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986). Part of my purpose in applying this method to Athanasius' text of the Gospels is to test Ehrman's conclusions concerning his methodology for studying patristic sources.

Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative analysis determines a textual witness's percentage of agreement with other witnesses over carefully selected units of variation. The quantitative analysis most frequently employed by NT text critics today is a method first introduced by E.C. Colwell.[3] Following this method, representative witnesses of the various text-types are collated against each other.[4] Then, all instances of

---

[3]See E.C. Colwell, Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament, NTTS 9 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969). The chapters entitled "Method in Locating a Newly Discovered Manuscript" (26-44) and "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships Between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts" (56-62; written with Ernest W. Tune) provide the basic outlines of this method. Instead of tabulating a witness's percentage of agreements with major representatives of various text-types in places where that witness varies from a single normative text (usually the TR), Colwell's quantitative analysis tabulates the witness's proportional agreements with the representative witnesses in all places where genetically significant variation takes place among any of the witnesses.

[4]In this study, the term "text-type" follows the definition and classifications of witnesses as found in Metzger, The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration, 3d enlarged ed. (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press). Metzger describes a "text-type" as "a particular constellation of readings in a characteristic pattern" (293). Metzger discusses the methods used to determine familial relationships among manuscripts (179-81) and the classification of manuscripts and text-types (287-95). Metzger also lists the representative witnesses of the various text-types (211-19). Recent studies (see the ones listed in footnote 6 below) have confirmed several of the classifications of manuscripts according to text-type made by such scholars as Westcott and Hort, von Soden, and Streeter (even though these earlier judgments were based on less rigorous

genetically significant variation are recorded.[5] Finally, percentages of agreements are tabulated between each witness and all other witnesses over those units of genetically significant variation.[6]

==========

statistical models).

The difficulties surrounding the identification of representative witnesses and even the existence of a "Caesarean text-type" are discussed in the following chapter (see especially footnotes 10 and 11).

In the case of patristic witnesses (as well as other partial or fragmentary witnesses), collations of the major representatives of the text-types are performed only in those places where the author provides evidence of the NT text (in the form of citations or significant adaptations or allusions).

[5]The designation "genetically significant" indicates a variant which provides information about genetic relationships between witnesses. A variant is not considered to be genetically significant if it can be attributed to scribal error (e.g. a nonsense reading) or common scribal tendencies (e.g. nu-movable, itacism, abbreviations, etc.). W.L. Richards demonstrated conclusively that these types of variants are not genetically significant in The Classification of the Greek Manuscripts of the Johannine Epistles, SBLDS 35 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977). Variants which represent singular readings (i.e. a reading supported by a single witness alone) are also not included in a quantitative analysis because they do not provide any information about textual relationships. In the collations in the previous chapter, genetically significant variants appear above the dashed line and singular readings below the dashed line.

[6]The effectiveness of this method has been demonstrated in several studies. Gordon D. Fee has frequently used this method, see Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66}) and Scribal Characteristics, SD 34 (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968); "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John," *NTS* 15 (1968-69): 23-44; "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Method in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations," *Bib* 52 (1971): 35-94; "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen: The Myth of Textual Recension in Alexandria," in New Dimensions in New Testament Study, ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C.

On the basis of their analysis of representative textual witnesses, Colwell and Tune concluded that:

> The quantitative definition of a text-type is a group of MSS that agree more than 70% of the time and is separated by a gap of about 10% from its neighbors.[7]

Several studies have confirmed Colwell and Tune's 70/10 definition for Alexandrian witnesses.[8] W.L. Richards modified Colwell's 70/10 definition by arguing that different textual groups must be allowed to set their own levels of agreement.[9] Richards' analysis of the Johannine Epistles demonstrated that the various Byzantine sub-groups tended to agree with each other approximately 90% of the

==========

Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 19-45; "The Text of John and Mark in the Writings of Chrysostom," *NTS* 26 (1979-80): 525-4; "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt," *NTS* 28 (1982): 348-64. Other studies which have used Colwell's quantitative analysis include Ehrman, Didymus; Richards, Classification; James Brooks, The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa, SBLNTGF 2 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991); Larry Hurtado, Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981); and Carroll D. Osburn, "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Hippolytus of Rome," *SecCent* 2 (1982): 97-124.

[7]E.C. Colwell and E.W. Tune, "The Quantitative Relationships between MS Text-Types" in Biblical and Patristic Studies, ed. J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thomson (New York: Herder, 1963), 29 (reprinted as "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts" in Colwell, Studies in Methodology, 56-62).

[8]For example, see Richards, Classification, and Fee, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria" and "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen."

[9]Richards, Classification, 43-68.

time.[10] Building upon the suggestion that textual groups should be allowed to set their own levels of agreement, Ehrman made the following suggestion concerning patristic sources:

> Thus the Colwell-Tune rule of thumb... should be lowered somewhat in view of the special character of Patristic quotations and allusions that occur frequently but sporadically, lowered perhaps to a ±65% agreement of a witness with group members with a 6-8% disparity between groups.[11]

Ehrman came to these percentages based upon his analysis of Didymus' text of Matthew, and then showed them to be true for the other Gospels as well.[12] These percentages will be used in the analysis of Athanasius' textual alignments.

Athanasius' Textual Relationships in Matthew

Athanasius cites from the Gospel of Matthew more than either of the other two Synoptic Gospels. There are 76 units of genetically significant variation in the portions of Matthew preserved in Athanasius' writings. Table 1 presents the complete results of the quantitative analysis. This chart provides the proportional agreement of each witness with all other witnesses in the 76 places where significant variation occurs.

---

[10]Richards, Classification, 43-68.

[11]Ehrman, Didymus, 202.

[12]Ehrman, Didymus, 222.

TABLE 1

Proportional Relationships of All Witnesses to One Another in Matthew
(76 Units of Variation - ERR indicates no shared units of variation)

	Ath	Aleph	AlephC	A	B	C	D	E	L	W	Delta	Theta	Pi	Omega	f1	f13	33	565	700	892	1241	TR	UBS4	a	b	e	k	Clem	Did
Ath	—	63.2	71.1	91.7	65.8	52.6	41.9	60.5	55.6	56.6	55.3	60.0	58.7	60.5	64.5	55.3	66.2	56.6	56.6	61.8	62.1	56.6	67.1	34.5	39.0	32.1	36.0	77.3	81.8
Aleph	63.2	—	92.1	100.0	82.9	84.2	56.5	67.1	72.2	68.4	68.4	69.3	76.0	71.1	73.7	72.4	74.3	76.3	71.1	81.6	63.8	72.4	88.2	37.9	39.0	39.3	52.0	54.5	81.8
AlephC	71.1	92.1	—	100.0	85.5	84.2	56.5	67.1	76.4	69.7	69.7	70.7	77.3	72.4	75.0	76.3	75.7	77.6	72.4	82.9	67.2	72.4	90.8	44.8	42.4	42.9	52.0	63.6	81.8
A	91.7	100.0	100.0	—	86.7	83.3	75.0	91.7	75.0	75.0	83.3	83.3	91.7	100.0	83.3	100.0	90.9	91.7	83.3	75.0	83.3	91.7	91.7	33.3	50.0	0.0	ERR	100.0	100.0
B	65.8	82.9	85.5	86.7	—	76.3	54.8	64.5	70.8	71.1	67.1	72.0	72.0	67.1	75.0	69.7	75.7	72.4	69.7	81.6	65.5	67.1	94.7	39.7	33.9	42.9	48.0	54.5	72.7
C	52.6	84.2	84.2	83.3	76.3	—	63.9	73.7	76.3	76.3	84.2	73.0	83.8	76.3	78.9	78.9	77.8	89.5	78.9	86.8	80.0	78.9	78.9	34.5	37.9	54.5	56.3	50.0	83.3
D	41.9	56.5	56.5	75.0	54.8	63.9	—	54.8	55.2	48.4	54.8	65.6	57.4	58.1	53.2	61.3	51.7	61.3	56.5	58.1	50.0	54.8	58.1	60.9	55.3	60.7	85.7	40.0	27.3
E	60.5	67.1	67.1	91.7	64.5	73.7	54.8	—	65.3	77.6	82.9	68.0	88.0	92.1	67.1	80.3	63.5	82.9	75.0	88.4	82.8	85.5	67.1	32.8	30.5	28.6	28.0	54.5	63.6
L	55.6	72.2	76.4	75.0	70.8	76.3	55.2	65.3	—	68.1	68.1	59.2	76.1	70.8	59.7	66.7	67.1	77.8	68.1	79.2	72.2	72.2	72.2	30.9	30.4	48.0	24.0	57.1	77.8
W	56.6	68.4	69.7	75.0	71.1	76.3	48.4	77.6	68.1	—	84.2	65.3	85.3	82.9	63.2	80.3	63.5	81.6	71.1	76.3	81.0	81.6	73.7	32.8	27.1	32.1	28.0	40.9	63.6
Delta	55.3	68.4	69.7	83.3	67.1	84.2	54.8	82.9	68.1	84.2	—	68.0	90.7	85.5	68.4	80.3	60.8	86.8	76.3	76.3	82.8	86.8	72.4	36.2	33.9	39.3	36.0	36.4	63.6
Theta	60.0	69.3	70.7	83.3	72.0	73.0	65.6	68.0	59.2	65.3	68.0	—	70.7	69.3	78.7	77.3	67.1	72.0	72.0	84.0	63.2	66.7	76.0	45.6	43.1	60.7	41.7	50.0	63.6
Pi	58.7	76.0	77.3	91.7	72.0	83.8	57.4	88.0	76.1	85.3	90.7	70.7	—	93.3	70.7	82.7	67.1	96.0	82.7	81.3	86.0	93.3	77.3	36.8	36.2	42.9	29.2	50.0	63.6
Omega	60.5	71.1	72.4	100.0	67.1	76.3	58.1	92.1	70.8	82.9	85.5	69.3	93.3	—	65.8	82.9	60.8	88.2	80.3	73.7	86.2	88.2	72.4	36.2	33.9	32.1	28.0	45.5	72.7
f1	64.5	73.7	75.0	83.3	75.0	78.9	53.2	67.1	59.7	63.2	68.4	78.7	70.7	65.8	—	71.1	75.7	72.4	65.8	71.1	69.0	68.4	78.9	41.4	42.4	57.1	56.0	54.5	63.6
f13	55.3	72.4	76.3	100.0	69.7	78.9	61.3	80.3	66.7	80.3	80.3	77.3	82.7	82.9	71.1	—	64.9	81.6	78.9	75.0	77.6	76.3	75.0	37.9	35.6	46.4	40.0	36.4	72.7
33	66.2	74.3	75.7	90.9	75.7	77.8	51.7	63.5	67.1	63.5	60.8	67.1	67.1	60.8	75.7	64.9	—	68.9	66.2	70.3	68.4	64.9	79.7	33.3	34.5	50.0	41.7	59.1	63.6
565	56.6	76.3	77.6	91.7	72.4	89.5	61.3	82.9	77.8	81.6	86.8	72.0	96.0	88.2	72.4	81.6	68.9	—	82.9	81.6	84.5	92.1	77.6	34.5	33.9	46.4	36.0	50.0	63.6
700	56.6	71.1	72.4	83.3	69.7	78.9	56.5	75.0	68.1	71.1	76.3	72.0	82.7	80.3	65.8	78.9	66.2	82.9	—	76.3	69.0	77.6	75.0	39.7	37.3	50.0	36.0	50.0	72.7
892	61.8	81.6	82.9	75.0	81.6	86.8	58.1	88.4	79.2	76.3	76.3	64.0	81.3	73.7	71.1	75.0	70.3	81.6	76.3	—	74.1	76.3	84.2	34.5	35.6	50.0	40.0	54.5	81.8
1241	62.1	63.8	67.2	83.3	65.5	80.0	50.0	82.8	72.2	81.0	82.8	63.2	86.0	86.2	69.0	77.6	68.4	84.5	69.0	74.1	—	82.8	67.2	26.1	31.9	28.6	15.4	47.1	50.0
TR	56.6	72.4	72.4	91.7	67.1	78.9	54.8	85.5	72.2	81.6	86.8	66.7	93.3	88.2	68.4	76.3	64.9	92.1	77.6	76.3	82.8	—	72.4	32.8	33.9	42.9	28.0	50.0	63.6
UBS4	67.1	88.2	90.8	91.7	94.7	78.9	58.1	67.1	72.2	73.7	72.4	76.0	77.3	72.4	78.9	75.0	79.7	77.6	75.0	84.2	67.2	72.4	—	43.1	37.3	46.4	48.0	54.5	72.7
a	34.5	37.9	44.8	33.3	39.7	34.5	60.9	32.8	30.9	32.8	36.2	45.6	36.8	36.2	41.4	37.9	33.3	34.5	39.7	34.5	26.1	32.8	43.1	—	84.5	57.1	68.0	47.1	10.0
b	39.0	39.0	42.4	50.0	33.9	37.9	55.3	30.5	30.4	27.1	33.9	43.1	36.2	33.9	42.4	35.6	34.5	33.9	37.3	35.6	31.9	33.9	37.3	84.5	—	64.3	72.0	47.1	20.0
e	32.1	39.3	42.9	0.0	42.9	54.5	60.7	28.6	48.0	32.1	39.3	60.7	42.9	32.1	57.1	46.4	50.0	46.4	50.0	50.0	28.6	42.9	46.4	57.1	64.3	—	100.0	30.8	0.0
k	36.0	52.0	52.0	ERR	48.0	56.3	85.7	28.0	24.0	28.0	36.0	41.7	29.2	28.0	56.0	40.0	41.7	36.0	36.0	40.0	15.4	28.0	48.0	68.0	72.0	100.0	—	16.7	25.0
Clem	77.3	54.5	63.6	100.0	54.5	50.0	40.0	54.5	57.1	40.9	36.4	50.0	50.0	45.5	54.5	36.4	59.1	50.0	50.0	54.5	47.1	50.0	54.5	47.1	47.1	30.8	16.7	—	100.0
Did	81.8	81.8	81.8	100.0	72.7	83.3	27.3	63.6	77.8	63.6	63.6	63.6	63.6	72.7	63.6	72.7	63.6	63.6	72.7	81.8	50.0	63.6	72.7	10.0	20.0	0.0	25.0	100.0	—

The results of the quantitative analysis become clearer when the witnesses are ranked according to their percentage agreement with Athanasius (see Table 2). Of the top eleven witnesses in proportional agreement with Athanasius, nine represent Alexandrian witnesses (Did Clem $\aleph^c$ UBS^4 B 33 $\aleph^*$ 1241 892). The other two witnesses include a Byzantine witness (A) and a Caesarean witness (f^1).

The placement of the Byzantine manuscript A at the top of the list (with 91.7% agreement) is somewhat surprising, but not completely unexpected. The same phenomenon occurred in Ehrman's examination of Didymus' text of Matthew. In Didymus' case, ms A agreed with Didymus in 80.0% of the units of variation (16/20) in comparison to the next highest textual witness, UBS^4, which agreed 68.1% of the time.[13] The major problem with using A in any quantitative analysis of Matthew is that A is largely lacunose in this Gospel. Its text does not begin until Mt 25:6. Ehrman concluded that "since A does not preserve even one-eighth of the total number of readings under consideration (20/163), its testimony must be discounted."[14] For similar reasons, the testimony of A for Athanasius

---

[13]Ehrman, Didymus, 191.

[14]Ehrman, Didymus, 190.

Table 2

Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with Athanasius in Genetically Significant Variation in Matthew (76 Units of Variation)

1.	A	11/12	91.7%
2.	Did	9/11	81.8%
3.	Clem	17/22	77.3%
4.	$\aleph^{c}$	54/76	71.1%
5.	UBS^{4}	51/76	67.1%
6.	33	49/74	66.2%
7.	B	50/76	65.8%
8.	f^{1}	49/76	64.5%
9.	$\aleph^{*}$	48/76	63.2%
10.	1241	36/58	62.1%
11.	892	47/76	61.8%
12.	E	46/76	60.5%
	Ω	46/76	60.5%
14.	Θ	45/75	60.0%
15.	Π	44/75	58.7%
16.	W	43/76	56.6%
	565	43/76	56.6%
	700	43/76	56.6%
	TR	43/76	56.6%
20.	L	40/72	55.6%
21.	Δ	42/76	55.3%
	f^{13}	42/76	55.3%
23.	C	20/38	52.6%
24.	D	26/62	41.9%
25.	b	23/59	39.0%
26.	k	9/25	36.0%
27.	a	20/58	34.5%
28.	e	9/28	32.1%

should also be discounted. A preserves less than one-sixth (12/76) of the variants found in Matthew. Its agreement with Athanasius (91.7%) is over 30% higher than his agreement with any other Byzantine witnesses (E Ω Π TR Δ). These disparate figures lead to the possibility that A is not a reliable Byzantine witness in the last four chapters of Matthew, or at the minimum, that in these twelve particular variants, the Alexandrian and Byzantine groups are very similar.[15] Because of its unusually high level of agreement, A will not be included in calculating the accumulative agreement according to textual groups (see Table 3).[16]

Returning to Table 2, the next two witnesses highest in agreement with Athanasius are Didymus (81.8%) and

---

[15]Only a full quantitative analysis would confirm this suspicion. The following abbreviated table indicates the high levels of agreement between A and representatives from every other textual group (with the exception of the Western group).

ℵ	12/12	100.0%	(Alex)
Ω	12/12	100.0%	(Byz)
f^{13}	12/12	100.0%	(Caes)
Ath	11/12	91.7%	(Alex)
E	11/12	91.7%	(Byz)
Π	11/12	91.7%	(Byz)
565	11/12	91.7%	(Caes?)
TR	11/12	91.7%	(Byz)
UBS^4	11/12	91.7%	(Alex)

[16]Based upon the peculiar findings of both Ehrman and myself concerning the textual alignments of A in the final chapters of Matthew, a closer examination at the textual character of A in this Gospel is necessary to determine whether some sort of block mixture exists.

Clement (72.3%). On the one hand, as with ms A, the small number of shared variants (Did = 11 and Clem = 22) makes their high level of agreement suspect, especially for calculating overall group agreement.[17] On the other hand, the high level of agreement could be an indication that all three fathers share a similar Alexandrian text. This possibility will be looked at more closely as the other Gospels are examined.

The next highest witness is $\aleph^c$, the corrections of Codex Sinaiticus (ranked 4th at 71.1% - 6.2% lower than Clem). Among the 76 units of genetically significant variation in Matthew, $\aleph^*$ is corrected six times.[18] Athanasius agrees with these corrections of $\aleph$ in all six instances. This significantly raises the level of Athanasius' agreement with $\aleph$ from 63.2% for $\aleph^*$ to 71.1% for $\aleph^c$. In addition to corrections in genetically significant variations, five singular readings of $\aleph$ are corrected.[19] Again, Athanasius agrees with the correction in every case.[20] In two additional instances, Athanasius agrees with

---

[17]For this reason, Clement and Didymus are not included in the calculations for overall agreement according to text-type.

[18]Corrections to $\aleph$ in significant units of variation can be found in Mt 6:25; 6:26; 6:28; 13:25; 18:20; and 24:17.

[19]Corrections to singular readings occur in Mt 1:23; 6:28(2X); 18:20; and 24:1.

[20]In one case (Mt 24:17), $\aleph$ is corrected from καταβατω to

the spellings of proper names found in $\aleph^c$ against the spellings in $\aleph^*$.[21] In all, Athanasius agrees with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ in thirteen out of thirteen instances in the Gospel of Matthew. The relationship between Athanasius and $\aleph^c$ will be examined for the rest of the Gospels as well.

The next seven witnesses, ranked 5th to 11th, include five Alexandrian witnesses (UBS[4] 33 B $\aleph^*$ 892), one Caesarean witness (f^1), and one witness of mixed character (1241).[22] These seven witnesses differ in their proportions of agreement by only 5.3% (from UBS[4] at 67.1% to 892 at 61.8%).[23] The presence of a Caesarean witness near the top of the list is not altogether surprising when one takes into account that the Caesarean text is characterized by

---

καταβητω, which agrees exactly with Athanasius' text against all other witnesses.

[21]In Mt 24:15, $\aleph^*$ reads ιηλ which is corrected in $\aleph^c$ to Δανιηλ, and in 24:26 $\aleph^*$ reads Ἰουδεα which is changed in $\aleph^c$ to Ἰουδαια.

[22]1241 has commonly been identified as a later-Alexandrian witness (Metzger, Text, 64-65, 216), although Lake and New argued that 1241 contained a larger number of Byzantine readings in Matthew and Mark (see Kirsopp Lake and Silva New, Six Collations of the New Testament Manuscripts, HTS 17 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932). Ehrman's study of Didymus' text raised serious questions about the textual character of 1241 (Didymus, 192-93, 205, 212, 219, 227 fn 8). Ehrman's decision not to include 1241 in either his quantitative or profile analyses is followed in this study.

[23]Including the Alexandrian witness $\aleph^c$, the eight witnesses ranked 4th through 11th cover a range of 9.3% difference in agreement (from $\aleph^c$ = 71.1% to 892 = 61.8%).

its mixture of Western readings and Alexandrian readings.[24] The high level of agreement between Athanasius and f^1 in Matthew could be due to the Alexandrian element found within f^1.[25]

The next twelve witnesses (ranked 12th to 23rd) represent a mixture of textual groupings - five Byzantine witnesses (E Ω Π TR Δ), two Caesarean witnesses (Θ f^{13}), two Alexandrian witnesses (L C), and three witnesses containing mixed or uncertain textual affinities (W 565 700). The range of agreement for these witnesses is 7.9% (from E = 60.5% to C = 52.6%).[26] This shows that the Byzantine and Caesarean witnesses tend to congregate in the middle of the list.

The presence of two Alexandrian witnesses near the bottom of the list (L - 20th at 55.6% and C - 23rd at

---

[24]See Bruce Metzger, Text, 215. The Alands, who for the most part do not categorize witnesses by textual groupings, place f^1 in Category III for the Gospels [see Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, The Text of the New Testament, tr. by Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1987), 128]. This category includes witnesses that have "a distinctive character with an independent text, usually important for establishing the original text, but particularly important for the history of the text" (Text, 106).

[25]Ehrman also discovered a high level of agreement between Didymus and f^1 in the Gospel of Luke and explained the higher level as due to a "curious infusion of Alexandrian readings throughout its [i.e. f^1] text" (Didymus, 205-205).

[26]If C is excluded, the other eleven witnesses fall within a very narrow range of 5.2% (from 60.5% to 55.3%).

52.6%) is the most puzzling result of the entire list. Athanasius' lack of agreement with C might be due to the fragmentary nature of the text of C. It preserves only 38 units of variation. This explanation does not work for L which contains 72 units of variation.[27] The lack of agreement of Athanasius with C and L might be due to the vagaries of patristic evidence, but it still contrasts sharply with the rest of the Alexandrian witnesses.

The final group of witnesses from Table 2 include five Western witnesses (D b k a e). These are separated from the next nearest witness by 10.7% (C = 52.6% compared to D = 41.9%). The Western witnesses fall within a fairly narrow range of 9.8% (e = 32.1%). The presence of all the Western witnesses at the bottom of the list points out the non-Western character of Athanasius' text in Matthew.

Athanasius' textual alignments are clarified further when the witnesses are arranged according to textual groups. Table 3 represents the witnesses' combined percentages of agreement with Athanasius in Matthew

---

[27]The quantitative analysis (see Table 1) reveals that for these 76 units of variation, Athanasius agrees less with C and L than any other Greek witness. Even the Western witness D agrees with C more (D = 63.9% compared to Ath = 52.6%) and with L at the same level (D = 55.2% compared to Ath = 55.6%). Only the Old Latin witnesses agree with C and L less than Athanasius.

Table 3

Proportional Agreement with Athanasius
Arranged by Textual Group in Matthew

ALEXANDRIAN	Agreements	Disagree.	% Agreement	
Primary Alexandrian				
UBS^4	51	25		
ℵ*	48	28		
B	50	26		
Totals	149	79	65.4%	(149/228)
Totals (w/o UBS^4)	98	54	64.5%	(98/152)
Secondary Alexandrian				
C	20	18		
L	40	32		
33	49	25		
892	47	29		
Totals (w/o ℵ^c)	156	104	60.0%	(156/260)
ℵ^c	54	22		
Totals (w/ ℵ^c)	210	126	62.5%	(210/336)
Average Alexandrian (w/ UBS^4 and ℵ^c)	344	223	63.7%	(359/564)
CAESAREAN				
Θ	45	30		
f^1	49	27		
f^{13}	42	34		
Totals	136	91	59.9%	(136/227)
BYZANTINE				
TR	43	33		
E	46	30		
Δ	42	34		
Π	44	31		
Ω	46	30		
Totals	221	158	58.3%	(221/379)
Totals (w/o TR)	178	125	58.7%	(178/303)

	Agreements	Disagree.	% Agreement
WESTERN			
D	26	36	
a	20	38	
b	23	36	
e	9	19	
k	9	16	
Totals	87	145	37.5% (87/232)

---

arranged by textual groups.[28] Table 3 is necessary because the data in Table 2 are obscured by the lack of significant breaks among individual witnesses.[29] Athanasius agrees most closely with the Primary Alexandrian group (65.4%) and least closely with the Western group (37.5%). His agreements with the Secondary Alexandrian group (62.5%),

==========

[28]In this table, as well as the aggregate tables for the other Gospels, witnesses having mixed or uncertain texts and the church fathers are not included in textual groups. Although UBS[4] and TR are not ancient witnesses, numerous studies have shown that they display close textual affinity to the Alexandrian and Byzantine groups respectively (see Chapter 4, footnote 9). In this table (and others like it), I have provided percentage agreements both with and without UBS[4] included. I have also included percentages if ℵ[c] is considered a Secondary Alexandrian witness based on some of my observations about the textual character of the corrections (see Chapter 7).

[29]The largest separation between percentages of agreement in Table 2 occur among the first five witnesses. For witnesses #5 through #21 the separation between any witness and the one that follows it is never more than 1.3%. A large separation occurs between C (#23) and the Western witnesses (D b k a e).

Caesarean group (59.9%), and Byzantine group (58.3%) do not demonstrate a statistically significant difference.[30] As the groupings stand, Athanasius shows an affinity to the Primary Alexandrian witnesses (satisfying Ehrman's 65% rule of thumb) that distinguishes itself by 2.9% from the Secondary Alexandrian group, 5.5% from the Caesarean group, 7.1% from the Byzantine group, and 27.9% from the Western group. The differences for the Caesarean, Byzantine, and Western groups satisfy the levels of disparity of agreement between groups suggested by Ehrman (6-8%).[31] When both Primary and Secondary Alexandrian witnesses are considered together Athanasius agreement with all Alexandrian witnesses (63.7%) does not differ by a statistically significant amount from the Caesarean group (only 3.8% difference). His agreement with the Alexandrian witnesses does distinguish itself significantly from his agreement with the Byzantine (5.4%) and Western (26.5%) groupings.[32]

---

[30]The percentage agreement with the Secondary Alexandrian group is reduced significantly by the presence of C and L (their anomalous level of agreement with Athanasius is discussed above). If these two mss are removed, Athanasius' agreement with the other Secondary Alexandrian witnesses (א^{c} 33 892) increases to 66.4% (150/226).

[31]Ehrman, Didymus, 202.

[32]If the two lowest Alexandrian witnesses (C and L) are removed, Athanasius' average agreement with all Alexandrian witnesses increases to 65.9% (299/454). This distinguishes him from the Caesarean group by 6.0%, from the Byzantine group by 7.9%, and the Western group by 28.4%. These figures satisfy Ehrman's suggested levels of difference.

The most conclusive point that can be gathered from the quantitative analysis of Athanasius' text of Matthew is that he does not exhibit a Western text. His text also displays a proclivity towards the Alexandrian text.

Athanasius' Textual Relationships in Mark

Amazingly, only one clear reference to the Gospel of Mark could be identified in Athanasius' writings. While some of the indeterminable Gospel references (see Appendix A) could come from Mark, it is clear that Athanasius did not cite from this Gospel very often.[33]

Athanasius' Textual Relationships in Luke

Athanasius refers to the Gospel of Luke much less frequently than Matthew. As a result, when examining his textual affinities in Luke there are only 30 units of significant variation for the entire Gospel. Even with these smaller numbers, however, the basic character of

---

This again demonstrates the ambiguities created by Athanasius' lack of agreement with C and L in Matthew.

[33]Several possible explanations for this phenomenon exist. Perhaps Athanasius knew Matthew and Luke better than Mark, and so he recalled texts from those Gospels rather than Mark. Perhaps Mark was not used within his community. Perhaps he had a personal distaste for Mark for some reason. Any explanation, however, remains in the realm of speculation. In actuality, Athanasius does not stand out among early Christian authors in this regard. The Gospel of Mark is rarely cited by *anyone* in the early church.

Athanasius' text of Luke can be determined. The full quantitative analysis for the Gospel of Luke is provided in Table 4. Table 5 provides a list of the witnesses ranked according to their proportional agreement with Athanasius in the 30 units of variation. A quick survey of Table 5 once again demonstrates that: (1) the Alexandrian witnesses tend to congregate towards the top of the list, (2) the Caesarean and Byzantine witnesses are grouped towards the middle of the list, and (3) the Western witnesses fall towards the bottom.

A closer examination reveals that five of the top six witnesses in agreement are Alexandrian (Ψ C $\aleph^c$ B 892). Only one Byzantine witness (Π) interjects. These six witnesses fall within a range of 6.7%. Once again, Alexandrian witnesses occupy an overwhelming majority of the top of the list.

The next sixteen witnesses (ranked 7th-22nd) fall within a very narrow range of 7.9% (from Δ = 70.0% to E = 62.1%), with the largest gap between any two witnesses being only 1.5%. Five Alexandrian witnesses (UBS^4 $\aleph^*$ P^{75} L 579) appear in the top half of this list of sixteen.[34] The other eleven witnesses include four Byzantine witnesses (Δ TR Ω E), two Caesarean witnesses (f^{13} f^1), four witnesses

---

[34]In total, ten of the top sixteen witnesses in Table 5 are Alexandrian.

TABLE 4

Proportional Relationships of All Witnesses to One Another in Luke
(30 Units of Variation - ERR indicates no shared units of variation)

	Ath	P75	Aleph	AlCor	A	B	C	D	E	L	W	Delta	Theta	Pi	Psi	Omega	f1	f13	33	565	579	700	892	1071	1241	TR	UBS4	a	b	e	Clem	Did
Ath	—	66.2	69.0	73.3	56.7	73.3	77.8	31.0	62.1	66.7	63.3	70.0	56.7	76.7	80.0	64.3	63.3	66.7	54.5	69.0	66.7	70.0	73.3	60.0	63.3	66.7	70.0	65.2	54.5	37.5	100	50.0
P75	66.2	—	66.4	61.8	59.1	90.9	80.0	38.1	61.9	61.8	66.2	66.2	54.5	63.6	66.2	57.1	63.6	72.7	66.7	57.1	77.3	63.6	63.6	66.2	63.6	66.2	66.4	47.1	52.9	38.9	0.0	80.0
Aleph	69.0	66.4	—	69.7	59.0	69.7	77.8	46.4	67.9	69.7	75.9	75.9	55.2	69.0	75.9	66.7	62.1	72.4	61.9	67.9	72.4	69.0	72.4	65.5	72.4	72.4	93.1	59.1	59.1	21.7	0.0	66.7
AlCor	73.3	61.8	69.7	—	70.0	66.7	66.9	48.3	75.9	66.7	76.7	83.3	63.3	76.7	80.0	71.4	70.0	80.0	66.2	75.9	73.3	76.7	73.3	73.3	83.3	80.0	90.0	69.6	66.2	33.3	0.0	66.7
A	56.7	59.1	59.0	70.0	—	63.3	55.6	41.4	66.2	63.3	80.0	66.7	80.0	80.0	76.7	85.7	73.3	83.3	59.1	79.3	70.0	66.7	70.0	76.7	73.3	90.0	66.7	52.2	63.6	37.5	0.0	66.7
B	73.3	90.9	69.7	66.7	63.3	—	66.7	44.8	62.1	66.7	70.0	70.0	50.0	63.3	73.3	60.7	56.7	66.7	59.1	62.1	73.3	63.3	66.7	63.3	70.0	66.7	96.7	60.9	59.1	33.3	0.0	66.7
C	77.8	80.0	77.8	66.9	55.6	66.7	—	44.4	66.7	66.7	66.7	77.8	77.8	66.7	77.8	62.5	77.8	77.8	77.8	66.7	77.8	66.7	77.8	66.7	55.6	66.7	77.8	71.4	28.6	28.6	ERR	0.0
D	31.0	38.1	46.4	48.3	41.4	44.8	44.4	—	46.4	37.9	48.3	51.7	37.9	37.9	48.3	44.4	34.5	48.3	33.3	39.3	27.6	44.8	44.8	44.8	55.2	48.3	48.3	69.6	59.1	66.7	0.0	33.3
E	62.1	61.9	67.9	75.9	86.2	62.1	66.7	46.4	—	62.1	79.3	93.1	72.4	86.2	82.8	96.4	72.4	89.7	63.6	93.1	62.1	93.1	75.9	82.8	79.3	96.6	65.5	50.0	61.9	39.1	0.0	60.0
L	66.7	61.8	69.7	66.7	63.3	66.7	66.7	37.9	62.1	—	76.7	70.0	63.3	63.3	73.3	60.7	70.0	73.3	72.7	62.1	73.3	63.3	66.7	73.3	76.7	66.7	90.0	56.5	54.5	29.2	0.0	66.7
W	63.3	66.2	75.9	76.7	80.0	70.0	66.7	48.3	79.3	76.7	—	86.7	80.0	80.0	76.7	78.6	73.3	90.0	59.1	79.3	63.3	80.0	70.0	83.3	73.3	83.3	73.3	65.2	66.2	41.7	0.0	66.7
Delta	70.0	66.2	75.9	83.3	86.7	70.0	77.8	51.7	93.1	70.0	86.7	—	80.0	86.7	90.0	89.3	80.0	96.7	66.2	86.2	70.0	93.3	83.3	90.0	86.7	96.7	73.3	60.9	63.6	37.5	0.0	66.7
Theta	56.7	54.5	55.2	63.3	80.0	50.0	77.8	37.9	72.4	63.3	80.0	80.0	—	66.7	70.0	67.9	66.7	83.3	77.3	65.5	70.0	73.3	63.3	83.3	73.3	76.7	53.3	56.5	50.0	41.7	0.0	66.7
Pi	76.7	63.6	69.0	76.7	80.0	63.3	66.7	37.9	86.2	63.3	80.0	86.7	66.7	—	83.3	89.3	73.3	83.3	54.5	93.1	56.7	93.3	83.3	76.7	73.3	90.0	66.7	60.9	72.7	37.5	100	50.0
Psi	80.0	66.2	75.9	80.0	76.7	73.3	77.8	48.3	82.8	73.3	76.7	90.0	70.0	83.3	—	78.6	70.0	86.7	59.1	75.9	66.7	83.3	86.7	80.0	83.3	86.7	76.7	60.9	59.1	37.5	0.0	66.7
Omega	64.3	57.1	66.7	71.4	85.7	60.7	62.5	44.4	96.4	60.7	78.6	89.3	67.9	89.3	78.6	—	75.0	85.7	61.9	96.4	57.1	96.4	78.6	78.6	75.0	92.9	64.3	50.0	61.9	39.1	100	40.0
f1	63.3	63.6	62.1	70.0	73.3	56.7	77.8	34.5	72.4	70.0	73.3	80.0	66.7	73.3	70.0	75.0	—	83.3	86.4	72.4	70.0	80.0	76.7	83.3	80.0	76.7	60.0	56.5	50.0	41.7	100	50.0
f13	66.7	72.7	72.4	80.0	83.3	66.7	77.8	48.3	89.7	73.3	90.0	96.7	83.3	83.3	86.7	85.7	83.3	—	72.7	82.8	73.3	90.0	80.0	93.3	83.3	93.3	70.0	56.5	59.1	41.7	0.0	66.7
33	54.5	66.7	61.9	66.2	59.1	59.1	77.8	33.3	63.6	72.7	59.1	66.2	77.3	54.5	59.1	61.9	86.4	72.7	—	59.1	72.7	63.6	72.7	77.3	66.2	63.6	63.6	38.9	29.4	27.8	ERR	66.7
565	69.0	57.1	67.9	75.9	79.3	62.1	66.7	39.3	93.1	62.1	79.3	86.2	65.5	93.1	75.9	96.4	72.4	82.8	59.1	—	55.2	93.1	75.9	75.9	72.4	89.7	65.5	54.5	66.7	34.8	100	40.0
579	66.7	77.3	72.4	73.3	70.0	73.3	77.8	27.6	62.1	73.3	63.3	70.0	70.0	56.7	66.7	57.1	70.0	73.3	72.7	55.2	—	63.3	66.7	66.7	63.3	66.7	70.0	39.1	40.9	29.2	0.0	66.7
700	70.0	63.6	69.0	76.7	86.7	63.3	66.7	44.8	93.1	63.3	80.0	93.3	73.3	93.3	83.3	96.4	80.0	90.0	63.6	93.1	63.3	—	83.3	83.3	80.0	96.7	66.7	56.5	68.2	41.7	100	50.0
892	73.3	63.6	72.4	73.3	70.0	66.7	77.8	44.8	75.9	66.7	70.0	83.3	63.3	83.3	86.7	78.6	76.7	80.0	72.7	75.9	66.7	83.3	—	73.3	76.7	80.0	70.0	52.2	54.5	29.2	100	50.0
1071	60.0	68.2	65.5	73.3	76.7	63.3	66.7	44.8	82.8	73.3	83.3	90.0	83.3	76.7	80.0	78.6	83.3	93.3	77.3	75.9	66.7	83.3	73.3	—	83.3	86.7	66.7	52.2	54.5	37.5	0.0	66.7
1241	63.3	63.6	72.4	83.3	73.3	70.0	55.6	55.2	79.3	76.7	73.3	86.7	73.3	73.3	83.3	75.0	80.0	83.3	68.2	72.4	63.3	80.0	76.7	83.3	—	83.3	73.3	60.9	59.1	37.5	0.0	66.7
TR	66.7	68.2	72.4	80.0	90.0	66.7	66.7	48.3	96.6	66.7	83.3	96.7	76.7	90.0	86.7	92.9	76.7	93.3	63.6	89.7	66.7	96.7	80.0	86.7	83.3	—	70.0	56.5	68.2	41.7	0.0	66.7
UBS4	70.0	86.4	93.1	90.0	66.7	96.7	77.8	48.3	65.5	90.0	73.3	73.3	53.3	66.7	76.7	64.3	60.0	70.0	63.6	65.5	70.0	66.7	70.0	66.7	73.3	70.0	—	65.2	63.6	29.2	0.0	66.7
a	65.2	47.1	59.1	69.6	52.2	60.9	71.4	69.6	50.0	56.5	65.2	60.9	56.5	60.9	60.9	50.0	56.5	56.5	38.9	54.5	39.1	56.5	52.2	52.2	60.9	56.5	65.2	—	81.8	65.2	ERR	20.0
b	54.5	52.9	59.1	66.2	63.6	59.1	28.6	59.1	61.9	54.5	68.2	63.6	50.0	72.7	59.1	61.9	50.0	59.1	29.4	66.7	40.9	68.2	54.5	54.5	59.1	68.2	63.6	81.8	—	63.6	ERR	40.0
e	37.5	38.9	21.7	33.3	37.5	33.3	28.6	66.7	39.1	29.2	41.7	37.5	41.7	37.5	37.5	39.1	41.7	41.7	27.8	34.8	29.2	41.7	29.2	37.5	37.5	41.7	29.2	65.2	63.6	—	ERR	20.0
Clem	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	ERR	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0	100	100	0.0	ERR	100	0.0	100	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	ERR	ERR	ERR	—	0.0
Did	50.0	80.0	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	0.0	33.3	60.0	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	50.0	66.7	40.0	50.0	66.7	66.7	40.0	66.7	50.0	50.0	66.7	66.7	66.7	66.7	20.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	—

Table 5

Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with Athanasius in Genetically Significant Variation in Luke (30 Units of Variation)

1.	Ψ	24/30	80.0%
2.	C	7/9	77.8%
3.	Π	23/30	76.7%
4.	$\aleph^c$	22/30	73.3%
	B	22/30	73.3%
	892	22/30	73.3%
7.	Δ	21/30	70.0%
	700	21/30	70.0%
	UBS^4	21/30	70.0%
10.	$\aleph^*$	20/29	69.0%
	565	20/29	69.0%
12.	P^{75}	15/22	68.2%
13.	L	20/30	66.7%
	f^{13}	20/30	66.7%
	579	20/30	66.7%
	TR	20/30	66.7%
17.	a	15/23	65.2%
18.	Ω	18/28	64.3%
19.	W	19/30	63.3%
	f^1	19/30	63.3%
	1241	19/30	63.3%
22.	E	18/29	62.1%
23.	1071	18/30	60.0%
24.	A	17/30	56.7%
	Θ	17/30	56.7%
26.	33	12/22	54.5%
	b	12/22	54.5%
28.	Did	3/6	50.0%
29.	e	9/24	37.5%
30.	D	9/29	31.0%

of mixed/unknown textual character (700 565 W 1241), and one Western witness (a). The positions of these witnesses demonstrate that the Alexandrian witnesses congregate towards the top of the list and the Byzantine and Caesarean witnesses towards the middle.

The bottom eight witnesses (ranked 23rd-30th) reveal the most diversity and cover a broad range (29%). The Western witnesses comprise the largest number of these witnesses (b e D). The other five witnesses include one uncertain witness (1071), one Byzantine witness (A), one Caesarean witness (Θ), and two Alexandrian (33 Did). With the few exceptions noted above, the basic alignments are what would be expected based on the results of Matthew.

There are some interesting shifts in the relationships between Athanasius and certain witnesses that can be observed when the results in Luke (Table 5) are compared with the results in Matthew (Table 2). First, the drop in the agreement between Athanasius and A is dramatic (from 1st = 91.7% in Mt to 24th = 56.7% in Lk). This immediately calls into question the high level of agreement between Athanasius and A in the last few chapters of Matthew. A similar decrease in agreement, although less severe in percentage, can be seen in 33 (from 6th = 66.2% in Mt to 26th 54.5% in Lk). In Luke, 33 and Did are the only Alexandrian witnesses that do not appear in the top half of

the list.[35] In the case of 33, the low level of agreement might be the result of the limited number of shared units of variation (only 30), but is more likely the product of the vagaries of patristic evidence.

In the opposite direction, two Alexandrian witnesses (L and C) that appear at the bottom of the list in Matthew have raised their levels of agreement significantly in Luke: L from 20th in Mt (= 55.6%) to 13th in Lk (= 66.7%), and C from 23rd in Mt (= 52.6%) to 2nd in Lk (= 77.8%)![36] Similarly, two Byzantine witnesses, Π and Δ, have also significantly increased their levels of agreement with Athanasius: Π from 15th in Mt (= 58.7%) to 3rd in Lk (= 76.7%), and Δ from 21st in Mt (= 55.3%) to 7th in Lk (= 70.0%). These dramatic shifts in agreement demonstrate that the fragmentary nature of patristic evidence (such as is found in Athanasius) leads to limited numbers of genetically significant units of variation which in turn

---

[35]The agreement between Athanasius and Didymus also falls between Mt (2nd = 81.8%) and Lk (28th = 50.0%). Given the small number of units of variation shared by the two fathers in the two Gospels (11 in Mt and 6 in Lk), this drop cannot be considered significant. For instance, a drop in a *single* unit of variation causes a 9% shift in Mt (9/11 = 81.8% and 8/11 = 72.7%) and 17% shift in Lk (3/6 = 50% and 2/6 = 33.3%)!

[36] C remains highly fragmentary in both Gospels. It preserves only 38 of 76 units of variation in Matthew and 11 of 30 units in Luke. These smaller numbers contribute to more dramatic shifts in agreement.

results in significant shifts in levels of agreement between witnesses from Gospel to Gospel (and in some cases even within the same Gospel).

As was observed in Matthew, Athanasius' agreement with $\aleph^c$ in Lk (73.3%) is higher than his agreement with the original hand of $\aleph^*$ (69.0%). Among the 30 units of significant variation in Luke, $\aleph$ is corrected three times (Lk 1:27; 17:2; 24:39). Athanasius agrees with the correction in two of the three cases (1:27; 24:39).[37] One singular reading of $\aleph^*$ is corrected (21:8), and once again, Athanasius agrees with $\aleph^c$.[38] In total, Athanasius agrees with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ a total of three out of four times in the Gospel of Luke.

A clearer picture of Athanasius' textual affinities in Luke emerges when the witnesses are arranged by textual group (see Table 6).[39] Athanasius is equally aligned to both the Primary (70.3%) and Secondary (70.2%) Alexandrian groups, for an overall Alexandrian agreement of 70.2% (above the Ehrman 65% criteria). The next closest grouping

---

[37]In the one case where Athanasius agrees with $\aleph^*$ against $\aleph^c$ (Lk 17:2), he follows the word order in $\aleph^*$ (των μικρων τουτων ενα) against $\aleph^c$ (ενα των μικρων τουτων).

[38]$\aleph^*$ omits the clause ο καιρος ηγγικεν μη which is inserted by $\aleph^c$.

[39]As was the case in Matthew, the lack of significant breaks between individual witnesses in Table 5 makes the grouping of manuscripts according to textual groups necessary.

Table 6

Proportional Agreement with Athanasius
Arranged by Textual Group in Luke

ALEXANDRIAN	Agreements	Disagree.	% Agreement	
Primary Alexandrian				
UBS^4	21	9		
P^{75}	15	7		
$\aleph^*$	20	9		
B	22	8		
Totals	78	33	70.3%	(78/111)
Totals (w/o UBS^4)	57	24	70.4%	(57/81)
Secondary Alexandrian				
C	7	2		
L	20	10		
Ψ	24	6		
33	12	10		
579	20	10		
892	22	8		
Totals (w/o $\aleph^c$)	105	46	69.5%	(105/151)
$\aleph^c$	22	8		
Totals (w/ $\aleph^c$)	127	54	70.2%	(127/181)
Average Alexandrian (w/ UBS^4 and $\aleph^c$)	205	87	70.2%	(205/292)
CAESAREAN				
Θ	17	13		
f^1	19	11		
f^{13}	20	10		
Totals	56	34	62.2%	(56/90)

	Agreements	Disagree.	% Agreement
BYZANTINE			
TR	20	10	
A	17	13	
E	18	11	
Δ	21	9	
Π	23	7	
Ω	18	10	
Totals	117	60	66.1% (117/177)
Totals (w/o TR)	97	50	66.0% (97/147)
WESTERN			
D	9	20	
a	15	8	
b	12	10	
e	9	15	
Totals	45	53	45.9% (45/98)

is the Byzantine witnesses (66.1%) followed by the Caesarean witnesses (62.2%). The Western witnesses again show the least agreement (45.9%). Athanasius' affinity to the Alexandrian witnesses (both Primary and Secondary) distinguishes itself from the Byzantine group by 4.1%, the Caesarean group by 8.0%, and the Western group by 24.3%. These levels approach (Byzantine), meet (Caesarean), and surpass (Western) the level of disparity between groups suggested by Ehrman (6-8%).[40] In the Gospel of Luke,

[40]Ehrman, Didymus, 202.

Athanasius' text displays a clear anti-Western proclivity and shows a closer relationship to the Alexandrian group than to either the Byzantine or Caesarean groups.

Athanasius' Textual Relationships in John

Athanasius cites from the Gospel of John more than any other Gospel. The higher christology of the Fourth Gospel was conducive to his arguments against Arianism, and this accounts for the greater number of references to it. Many of his Johannine citations are found in the context of Arian claims concerning the non-divinity of the Son.

The collation of Athanasius' text of the Fourth Gospel has produced 131 units of genetically significant variation. Table 7 provides the full quantitative analysis, and Table 8 ranks the witnesses according to their agreement with Athanasius in these units of variation.

An overview of Table 8 shows that seven of the top nine witnesses are Alexandrian (892 Orig Ψ UBS^4 $\aleph^c$ 33 L), one Caesarean witness (f^1), and one witness of uncertain textual character (565). All nine of these witnesses agree with Athanasius' text over 70% of the time and cover a range of 8.3% (from 892 = 78.5% to L = 70.2%). As was the case in Matthew and Luke, Alexandrian witnesses are predominant at the top of the list in John.

TABLE 7

Proportional Relationships of All Witnesses to One Another in John
(131 Units of Variation - ERR indicates no shared units of variation)

	Ath	P45	P66	P75	Aleph	AlCor	A	B	C	D	E	L	W	Delta	Theta	Pi	Psi	Omeg	f1	f13	33	565	579	700	892	1241	TR	UBS4	a	b	e	Clem	Orig	Did
Ath	—	65.0	63.0	66.7	57.3	70.5	68.3	67.4	66.7	50.0	67.2	70.2	61.6	63.4	67.4	67.5	76.3	67.7	72.5	67.9	70.3	72.4	61.4	66.4	76.5	65.6	69.5	74.4	46.8	49.1	44.5	66.7	77.9	61.8
P45	65.0	—	65.0	76.9	60.0	60.0	65.0	75.0	ERR	55.0	55.0	65.0	65.0	60.0	70.0	60.0	70.0	65.0	60.0	55.0	60.0	66.7	65.0	65.0	ERR	21.1	65.0	75.0	58.8	58.8	50.0	ERR	71.4	60.0
P66	63.0	65.0	—	74.0	71.8	74.5	64.0	77.8	81.8	61.8	60.2	75.9	71.4	58.3	63.0	59.4	67.6	59.8	73.1	58.3	72.4	66.7	58.1	60.2	62.3	56.6	60.2	82.4	53.3	54.9	44.1	66.8	77.8	63.6
P75	66.7	76.9	74.0	—	69.4	75.7	67.2	85.3	78.6	54.2	69.3	82.7	78.5	69.3	72.0	68.7	73.3	71.6	74.7	64.0	77.0	74.0	74.7	70.7	72.7	56.2	68.0	86.7	47.8	48.5	47.8	50.0	86.5	45.8
Aleph	57.3	60.0	71.8	69.4	—	67.1	64.1	71.8	69.4	62.4	60.5	69.4	73.1	57.3	63.7	63.2	64.5	61.0	69.4	58.9	70.5	65.2	62.5	59.7	60.0	55.7	60.5	76.6	54.3	55.8	45.3	61.1	74.6	52.9
AlCor	70.5	60.0	74.5	75.7	67.1	—	76.2	78.0	78.8	63.3	69.8	80.6	76.6	66.7	72.4	73.0	76.7	69.5	78.3	68.2	81.9	74.8	68.0	69.8	75.0	66.9	69.8	85.8	57.0	61.3	49.1	72.2	85.1	52.9
A	68.3	65.0	64.0	67.2	64.1	76.2	—	66.6	61.2	56.1	79.7	74.8	68.6	82.1	81.0	89.1	81.3	82.8	79.7	78.9	77.7	80.6	68.1	82.9	78.9	70.2	83.7	75.2	55.9	58.8	43.7	73.3	78.5	54.5
B	67.4	75.0	77.8	85.3	71.8	78.0	66.6	—	82.7	58.2	65.9	82.9	83.0	65.1	72.9	66.1	75.2	68.0	78.3	62.0	74.6	71.9	66.4	66.7	69.8	57.9	66.7	92.2	52.3	52.8	47.3	66.7	82.4	61.8
C	66.7	ERR	81.8	78.6	69.4	78.8	61.2	82.7	—	56.0	68.5	88.9	81.8	66.7	75.0	72.0	77.8	69.8	83.3	68.5	82.7	82.6	74.1	66.7	76.1	67.9	68.5	86.5	48.8	51.2	58.1	62.5	78.3	54.5
D	50.0	55.0	61.8	54.2	62.4	63.3	56.1	58.2	56.0	—	53.3	59.8	60.2	51.6	52.5	57.9	59.0	52.9	59.8	49.2	59.7	51.4	50.8	52.5	58.3	47.9	52.5	64.8	65.7	68.3	58.3	70.6	58.5	37.5
E	67.2	55.0	60.2	69.3	60.5	69.8	79.7	65.9	68.5	53.3	—	70.2	66.1	93.1	80.6	82.9	80.9	92.3	78.6	78.6	73.4	78.4	69.3	93.1	81.5	71.9	92.4	70.5	54.1	50.0	46.4	50.0	75.0	50.0
L	70.2	65.0	75.9	82.7	69.4	80.6	74.8	82.9	88.9	59.8	70.2	—	81.3	70.2	72.1	72.4	80.2	70.0	80.9	68.7	85.9	76.7	75.6	71.0	78.5	70.3	70.2	89.1	53.2	56.5	48.2	77.8	83.8	61.8
W	61.6	65.0	71.4	78.5	73.1	76.6	68.6	83.0	81.8	60.2	66.1	81.3	—	67.0	68.8	63.8	68.8	62.5	76.6	60.7	76.4	72.2	73.1	64.3	68.5	60.0	62.5	81.3	50.5	56.4	51.0	60.0	81.5	61.3
Delta	63.4	60.0	58.3	69.3	57.3	66.7	82.1	65.1	66.7	51.6	93.1	70.2	67.0	—	79.8	82.1	80.2	93.1	76.3	77.9	71.9	77.6	68.5	92.4	76.9	71.1	91.6	68.2	53.2	49.1	46.4	38.9	70.6	52.9
Theta	67.4	70.0	63.0	72.0	63.7	72.4	81.0	72.9	75.0	52.5	80.6	72.1	68.8	79.8	—	80.2	79.8	79.7	77.5	79.8	73.8	77.2	68.8	76.3	73.0	69.8	79.8	76.0	56.0	52.8	47.3	61.1	76.5	58.8
Pi	67.5	60.0	59.4	68.7	63.2	73.0	89.1	66.1	72.0	57.9	82.9	72.4	63.8	82.1	80.2	—	81.3	86.1	76.4	80.5	73.6	78.7	67.2	84.6	78.9	73.6	88.6	74.4	58.8	53.5	43.7	66.7	76.9	45.2
Psi	76.3	70.0	67.6	73.3	64.5	76.7	81.3	75.2	77.8	59.0	80.9	80.2	68.8	80.2	79.8	81.3	—	82.3	81.7	75.6	77.3	79.3	71.7	82.4	81.5	70.3	84.0	80.6	53.2	56.5	50.0	66.7	86.8	50.0
Omeg	67.7	65.0	59.8	71.6	61.0	69.5	82.6	68.0	69.8	52.9	92.3	70.0	62.5	93.1	79.7	86.1	82.3	—	78.5	78.5	74.8	79.1	67.5	93.8	78.1	69.3	95.4	72.7	54.1	50.0	43.6	52.9	73.1	51.5
f1	72.5	60.0	73.1	74.7	69.4	78.3	79.7	78.3	83.3	59.8	78.6	80.9	78.6	76.3	77.5	76.4	81.7	78.5	—	74.8	78.1	92.2	73.2	77.9	83.1	64.8	79.4	82.9	55.0	59.3	50.9	72.2	85.3	55.9
f13	67.9	55.0	58.3	64.0	58.9	68.2	78.9	62.0	68.5	49.2	78.6	68.7	60.7	77.9	79.8	80.5	75.6	78.5	74.8	—	73.4	75.9	64.6	77.1	75.4	73.4	81.7	69.8	55.0	48.1	47.3	55.6	70.6	58.8
33	70.3	60.0	72.4	77.0	70.5	81.9	77.7	74.6	82.7	59.7	73.4	85.9	76.4	71.9	73.8	73.6	77.3	74.8	78.1	73.4	—	78.8	72.8	70.3	79.4	75.4	73.4	82.5	55.7	54.3	43.0	83.3	79.1	64.7
565	72.4	66.7	66.7	74.0	65.2	74.8	80.6	71.9	82.6	51.4	78.4	76.7	72.2	77.6	77.2	78.7	79.3	79.1	92.2	75.9	78.8	—	71.4	77.6	87.1	65.5	81.9	77.2	55.2	53.7	46.4	61.1	81.0	51.6
579	61.4	65.0	58.1	74.7	62.5	68.0	68.1	66.4	74.1	50.8	69.3	75.6	73.1	68.5	68.8	67.2	71.7	67.5	73.2	64.6	72.8	71.4	—	67.7	84.6	61.6	68.5	68.8	49.5	50.0	47.2	66.7	79.1	55.9
700	66.4	65.0	60.2	70.7	59.7	69.8	82.9	66.7	66.7	52.5	93.1	71.0	64.3	92.4	78.3	84.6	82.4	93.8	77.9	77.1	70.3	77.6	67.7	—	83.1	68.8	93.9	71.3	53.2	51.9	48.2	50.0	76.5	47.1
892	78.5	ERR	82.3	72.7	60.0	75.0	78.9	69.8	78.1	58.3	81.5	78.5	68.5	76.9	73.0	78.9	81.5	78.1	83.1	75.4	79.4	87.1	84.6	83.1	—	68.8	83.1	74.6	47.4	48.2	50.0	50.0	78.6	38.1
1241	65.6	21.1	56.6	56.2	55.7	66.9	70.2	57.9	67.9	47.9	71.9	70.3	60.0	71.1	69.8	73.6	70.3	69.3	64.8	73.4	75.4	65.5	61.6	68.8	68.8	—	71.1	65.1	52.8	44.8	41.1	66.7	63.6	57.6
TR	69.5	65.0	60.2	68.0	60.5	69.8	83.7	66.7	68.5	52.5	92.4	70.2	62.5	91.6	79.8	88.6	84.0	95.4	79.4	81.7	73.4	81.9	68.5	93.9	83.1	71.1	—	72.9	56.9	51.9	46.4	44.4	76.5	47.1
UBS4	74.4	75.0	82.4	86.7	76.6	85.8	75.2	92.2	88.5	64.8	70.5	89.1	81.3	68.2	76.0	74.4	80.6	72.7	82.9	69.8	82.5	77.2	68.8	71.3	74.6	65.1	72.9	—	57.8	60.2	50.0	72.2	88.2	61.8
a	46.8	58.8	53.3	47.8	54.3	57.0	55.9	52.3	48.8	65.7	54.1	53.2	50.5	53.2	56.0	58.8	53.2	54.1	55.0	55.0	55.7	55.2	49.5	53.2	47.4	52.8	56.9	57.8	—	77.8	62.0	41.7	56.4	37.0
b	49.1	58.8	54.9	48.5	55.8	61.3	58.8	52.8	51.2	68.3	50.0	56.5	56.4	49.1	52.8	53.5	56.5	50.0	59.3	48.1	54.3	53.7	50.0	51.9	48.2	44.8	51.9	60.2	77.8	—	68.2	58.3	58.2	37.0
e	44.5	50.0	44.1	47.8	45.3	49.1	43.7	47.3	58.1	58.3	46.4	48.2	51.0	46.4	47.3	43.7	50.0	43.6	50.9	47.3	43.0	46.4	47.2	48.2	50.0	41.1	46.4	50.0	62.0	68.2	—	33.3	49.1	27.6
Clem	66.7	ERR	66.8	50.0	61.1	72.2	73.3	66.7	62.5	70.6	50.0	77.8	60.0	38.9	61.1	66.7	66.7	52.9	72.2	55.6	83.3	61.1	66.7	50.0	50.0	66.7	44.4	72.2	41.7	58.3	33.3	—	100	60.0
Orig	77.9	71.4	77.8	86.5	74.6	85.1	78.5	82.4	78.3	58.5	75.0	83.6	81.5	70.6	76.5	76.9	86.8	73.1	85.3	70.6	79.1	81.0	79.1	76.5	76.6	63.6	76.5	88.2	56.4	58.2	49.1	100	—	53.8
Did	61.8	60.0	63.6	45.8	52.9	52.9	54.5	61.8	54.5	37.5	50.0	61.8	61.3	52.9	58.8	45.2	50.0	51.5	55.9	58.8	64.7	51.6	55.9	47.1	38.1	57.6	47.1	61.8	37.0	37.0	27.6	60.0	53.8	—

Table 8

Witnesses Ranked According to Proportional Agreement with Athanasius in Genetically Significant Variation in John (131 Units of Variation)

1.	892	51/65	78.5%
2.	Orig	53/68	77.9%
3.	Ψ	100/131	76.3%
4.	UBS^4	96/129	74.4%
5.	f^1	95/131	72.5%
6.	565	84/116	72.4%
7.	$\aleph^c$	91/129	70.5%
8.	33	90/128	70.3%
9.	L	92/131	70.2%
10.	TR	91/131	69.5%
11.	A	84/123	68.3%
12.	f^{13}	89/131	67.9%
13.	Ω	88/130	67.7%
14.	Π	83/123	67.5%
15.	B	87/129	67.4%
	Θ	87/129	67.4%
17.	E	88/131	67.2%
18.	P^{75}	50/75	66.7%
	C	36/54	66.7%
	Clem	12/18	66.7%
21.	700	87/131	66.4%
22.	1241	84/128	65.6%
23.	P^{45}	13/20	65.0%
24.	Δ	83/131	63.4%
25.	P^{66}	68/108	63.0%
26.	Did	21/34	61.8%
27.	W	69/112	61.6%
28.	579	78/127	61.4%
29.	$\aleph^*$	71/124	57.3%
30.	D	61/122	50.0%

31.	b	53/108	49.1%
32.	a	51/109	46.8%
33.	e	49/110	44.5%

The next nineteen witnesses represent a mixture of witnesses - six Alexandrian witnesses (B P^{75} C P^{66} Did 579), six Byzantine witnesses (TR A Ω Π E Δ), three Caesarean witnesses (f^{13} Θ P^{45}), and four witnesses of uncertain textual type (Clem 700 1241 W). These witnesses cover a range of 8.1% (from TR = 69.5% to 579 =61.4%). Unlike the case in Matthew and Luke, five Alexandrian witnesses appear in the bottom half of the list. This "slippage" in Alexandrian support will be examined more closely below. The positioning of the Byzantine and Caesarean witnesses towards the middle of the list is similar to what was observed for the other Gospels. The bottom five witnesses in Table 8 are all Western (ℵ* D a b e).[41] This once again confirms the anti-Western character of Athanasius' text.

==========

[41] ℵ* is listed as a Western witness although it actually exhibits a mixed text. Gordon Fee has shown that ℵ* preserves a Western text in Jn 1:1-8:38 but an Alexandrian text in 8:39-21:25. When computed according to these blocks, Athanasius agrees with ℵ* 53.8% (21/39) in Jn 1:1-8:39 but only 58.8% (50/85) in Jn 8:39-21:25. One would expect Athanasius' agreement with ℵ* to increase substantially in the last section where ℵ displays an Alexandrian text.

Manuscript 892 stands at the top of Table 8 (78.5%) followed closely by Origen (77.9%). As a secondary Alexandrian witness, 892 consistently appears in the top half of the lists for all three Gospels (eleventh in Mt = 61.8%; tie for fourth in Lk = 73.3%). Given the Alexandrian character of 892, Athanasius high level of agreement is expected. Origen's text has been thoroughly examined for the Gospel of John.[42] The high level of agreement between Athanasius and Origen in John is not surprising given the Alexandrian provenance of several of Origen's writings.

The next two witnesses in Table 8 are Ψ and UBS^4. Both of these witnesses are clearly Alexandrian. Ψ appears high in the lists for both Luke (1st = 80.0%) and John (3rd = 76.3%).[43] UBS^4 appears near the top of the lists for all three Gospels (5th in Mt = 67.1%; tie for 7th in Lk = 70.0%; and 4th in Jn = 74.4%). Taken together, the top four witnesses in Table 8 are all Alexandrian and combine

---

[42]B. Ehrman, G. Fee, and M. Holmes, The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen, vol. 1, SBLNTGF 3 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992). The analysis of Origen's text will appear in Volume 2 of this work (forthcoming). Since Origen's text has not been gathered for Matthew or Luke, Athanasius' text cannot be compared to Origen's text in these Gospels.

[43]Athanasius' alignment with Ψ in Matthew cannot be determined because Ψ is lacunose for this Gospel.

for an impressively high 76.3% (300/393) agreement with Athanasius in the Fourth Gospel.

Athanasius' level of agreement with f^1 remains high in John as it did in Matthew (8th in Mt = 64.5%; 5th in Jn = 72.5%), slipping in position only in Luke (19th = 63.3%). As stated earlier, the high level of agreement is probably due to the presence of several Alexandrian readings in f^1 rather than a closeness of Athanasius to the Caesarean text.[44]

As in Matthew and Luke, Athanasius agreement with $\aleph^c$ (70.5%) increases dramatically over that of $\aleph^*$ (57.3%). Among the 131 units of genetically significant variation in John, $\aleph$ is corrected sixteen times.[45] Athanasius agrees with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ fifteen times and disagrees with both $\aleph^*$ and $\aleph^c$ one time (Jn 1:18). In addition, Athanasius agrees

---

[44]If Athanasius was closely related to the Caesarean text, his agreement with the other Caesarean witnesses would be much higher. Neither of the other two Caesarean witnesses remains consistently high in agreement (Θ = 60.0%, 56.7%, 67.4% for a total of 63.7% for all three Gospels; and f^{13} = 55.3%, 66.7%, 67.9% for a total of 63.7%). The total agreement of f^1 for all three Gospels is 68.8%.

[45]Corrections to $\aleph$ in significant units of variation can be found in Jn 1:3, 1:13, 1:18(2X), 6:38, 6:39, 6:46, 8:59, 12:32, 14:28, 16:15, 17:5, 17:22, 18:37, and 19:39(2X). In Jn 6:39, $\aleph^*$ omits a portion of text which contains two significant units of variation. Athanasius agrees with the text provided by $\aleph^c$ in both of these units. The same holds true for Jn 8:39, where $\aleph^*$ omits a portion of text. Once again, Athanasius agrees with the text provided by $\aleph^c$ in two units of significant variation.

with $\aleph^c$ in all nine places where singular readings of $\aleph^*$ have been corrected.[46] Thus, in the Fourth Gospel, Athanasius agrees with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ a total of twenty-five out of twenty-five times![47] This once again reveals the close alignment between Athanasius and the corrections of $\aleph$.

A few other individual witnesses deserve comment based upon a comparison of their agreement in John with their agreement in Matthew and Luke. Athanasius' agreement with A in John (68.3%) is an increase over Luke (56.7%), but it is still far below its level of agreement in Matthew (91.7%). The results from Luke and John indicate that the high level of agreement between Athanasius and A in Matthew is peculiar and that a complete analysis of the textual character of A in the end of Matthew needs to be performed.

In order to understand Athanasius' relationship to 33, it is important to consider the evidence from the Fourth Gospel. As in Matthew, Athanasius' agreement with 33 remains high in the Fourth Gospel (6th in Mt = 66.2%; 8th

---

[46]Corrections to singular readings occur in Jn 1:17, 7:6, 8:12, 8:36, 14:16, 16:25, 17:4, 17:17, and 18:37. In Jn 17:17, $\aleph^*$ omits a portion of text. In the portion of text supplied by $\aleph^c$, Athanasius agrees with $\aleph^c$ in one unit of significant variation.

[47]For the purposes of comparing Athanasius' agreement with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$, the one instance in which Athanasius disagrees with both the original and the corrected readings (Jn 1:18) is not included.

in Jn = 70.3%). The high level of agreement between Athanasius and 33 in these two Gospels makes the low level of agreement in Luke (26th = 54.5%) appear to be anomalous.

Athanasius' agreement with Didymus in John is strikingly low (26th = 61.8%). This could be explained by the mixed nature of Didymus' text in John, but unfortunately this is not the case. Ehrman determined that Didymus' text is "predominantly Alexandrian" in Jn 1:1-6:46, but that Didymus' "textual consanguinity shifts dramatically in the remaining portion of the Fourth Gospel".[48] Ehrman goes on to state that Didymus' text from Jn 6:47 to the end of the Gospel is not predominantly related to any of the text types, but appears to be a highly eclectic text.[49] Comparing Athanasius to Didymus in Jn 1:1-6:46 results in a 57.1% (8/14) agreement, whereas in Jn 6:47-21:25 it results in a 65.0% (13/20) agreement. Using Ehrman's division of Didymus' text of John, Athanasius agrees less with the Alexandrian section than with the eclectic portion! As a result, Athanasius' low level of agreement with Didymus cannot be explained on the basis of Didymus' mixed text alone. Looking at all three Gospels, the small number of units of variation shared

---

[48]Ehrman, Didymus, 211 and 214.

[49]Ehrman, Didymus, 215.

between Athanasius and Didymus (11 in Mt; 6 in Lk; 34 in Jn) prevent making too much of the results of the comparison of their texts. Even with this disclaimer, however, the overall low level of agreement between Athanasius and Didymus (33/51 = 64.7%) remains perplexing.

Arranging the witnesses by textual groups in the Fourth Gospel does not significantly clarify Athanasius' textual affinities (see Table 9). Athanasius is most closely aligned with the Secondary Alexandrian group (70.3%).[50] The next highest group in alignment is the Caesarean Group (69.1%).[51] Athanasius' agreement with the Byzantine group (67.2%) and the Primary Alexandrian group (66.7%) follow closely behind.[52] The Western group displays the least agreement with Athanasius (48.2%). This once

---

[50]Athanasius' agreement with 579 (61.4%) is the lowest in the Secondary Alexandrian group. The next lowest witness is C (66.7%) which represents a 5.3% increase in agreement. This makes Athanasius' low level of agreement with 579 appear to be anomalous. If 579 were removed from the group, Athanasius' agreement with the other members of this group ($\aleph^c$ C L Ψ 33 892) would increase to 72.1% (460/638).

[51]Athanasius' agreement with the Caesarean group is exaggerated by the presence of f^1 (72.5%). If f^1 were excluded from this group, Athanasius' overall agreement would decrease to 67.5% (189/280).

[52]Athanasius agreement with the various Byzantine witnesses remains fairly constant (from TR = 69.5% to Δ = 63.4%). His agreement with Primary Alexandrian witnesses is somewhat erratic, ranging from UBS^4 (74.4%) to $\aleph^*$ (Jn 8:39-21:25 = 58.8%) - a 15.6% range. If $\aleph^*$ were dropped from the Primary Alexandrian group, Athanasius' agreement with the rest of the members of this group would increase to 68.3% (301/441).

Table 9

Proportional Agreement with Athanasius
Arranged by Textual Group in John

ALEXANDRIAN	Agreements	Disagree.	% Agreement	
Primary Alexandrian				
UBS^4	96	33		
P^{66}	68	40		
P^{75}	50	25		
$\aleph^*$ (8:39-21:25)	50	35		
B	87	42		
Totals	351	175	66.7%	(351/526)
Totals (w/o UBS^4)	255	142	64.2%	(255/397)
Secondary Alexandrian				
C	36	18		
L	92	39		
Ψ	100	31		
33	90	38		
579	78	49		
892	51	14		
Totals	447	189	70.3%	(447/636)
$\aleph^c$	91	38		
Totals (w/ $\aleph^c$)	538	227	70.3%	(538/765)
Average Alexandrian (w/ UBS^4 and $\aleph^c$)	798	364	68.9%	(889/1291)
CAESAREAN				
P^{45}	13	7		
Θ	87	42		
f^1	95	36		
f^{13}	89	42		
Totals	284	127	69.1%	(284/411)

	Agreements	Disagree.	% Agreement	
BYZANTINE				
TR	91	40		
A	84	39		
E	88	43		
Δ	83	48		
Π	83	40		
Ω	88	42		
Totals	517	252	67.2%	(517/769)
Totals (w/o TR)	426	212	66.8%	(426/638)
WESTERN				
ℵ* (1:1-8:38)	21	18		
D	61	61		
a	51	58		
b	53	55		
e	49	61		
Totals	235	253	48.2%	(235/488)

again indicates the non-Western character of his text. When his overall alignments with the various groups are compared, the results are not conclusive. Athanasius' overall agreement with the Alexandrian group is 68.9%.[53] Excluding the Western group, the largest difference between

[53]If ℵ* was excluded from the Primary Alexandrian group and 579 was excluded from the Secondary Alexandrian group, then Athanasius' overall agreement with the Alexandrian witnesses would increase to 70.5% (670/950).

any two groups is between the Secondary Alexandrians and the Primary Alexandrians - a separation of only 3.6%. The Caesarean and Byzantine groups fall within this range. The figures from Table 9 show that Athanasius' agreement with the various textual groups satisfies Ehrman's 65% criterion in every case except the Western Group. On the other hand, the separation between the levels of agreement (excluding the Western Group) is not distinguished by Ehrman's suggested 6-8%.[54] While one could possibly suggest that Athanasius' text in John leans towards the Secondary Alexandrian group, the differences between the levels of agreement among the various groups (with the exception of the Western group) are not statistically significant.

---

[54]Even with the worst Alexandrian witnesses (ℵ* and 579) and the best Caesarean witness (f^1) omitted (presuming that they are anomalous), the differences in agreement between the groups still do not reach Ehrman's 6-8% level. In the following table, ℵ* and 579 are excluded from the Alexandrian witnesses:

Primary Alexandrian (w/o ℵ*)	68.3%	(301/441)
Secondary Alexandrian (w/o 579)	72.1%	(460/638)
Total Alexandrian	70.5%	(761/1079)
Caesarean	69.1%	(284/411)
Caesarean (w/o f^1)	67.5%	(189/280)
Byzantine	67.2%	(517/769)
Western	48.2%	(235/488)

In this emended table, Athanasius' affinity to the Secondary Alexandrian group differs in its level of agreement from the Caesarean Group by only 4.6% and the Byzantine Group by 4.9% - still falling short of Ehrman's levels.

Athanasius' Textual Relationships in Matthew, Luke, and John

The examination of Athanasius' textual alignments in each of the individual Gospels (excluding Mark for lack of evidence) produces mixed results. In Matthew, he is most closely aligned to the Primary Alexandrians; in Luke he agrees with the Primary and Secondary Alexandrian groups equally; and in John, he is most closely aligned to the Secondary Alexandrians. In order to attempt to clarify Athanasius' textual affinities further, an aggregate tabulation of Athanasius' agreement for all three Gospels needs to be given. Table 10 provides the combined results of the proportional relationships of textual groups to Athanasius in Matthew, Luke, and John.

Unfortunately, the results from Table 10 are not entirely conclusive. Athanasius agrees most closely with the Secondary Alexandrian sub-group (68.3%), but this level of agreement does not differ significantly from the Primary Alexandrian sub-group (66.8%), the Caesarean group (65.4%), or the Byzantine group (64.8%). All four of these three groups fall within a range of only 3.5%. The only conclusive result of the overall tabulation is the anti-Western character of Athanasius text. He agrees with the Western group only 44.9% - a difference of 23.4% from the Secondary Alexandrian group.

Table 10

Proportional Relationships to Athanasius Arranged According to Textual Grouping in Mt, Lk, and Jn

	Matthew	Luke	John	Totals	Avg.
ALEXANDRIAN					
Primary Alexandrian					
UBS^4	51/76	21/30	96/129	168/235	71.5%
P^{66}			68/108	68/108	63.0%
P^{75}		15/22	50/75	65/97	67.0%
ℵ*	48/76	20/29	50/85	118/190	62.1%
B	50/76	22/30	87/129	159/235	67.7%
Totals				578/865	66.8%
Secondary Alexandrian					
ℵ^c	54/76	22/30	91/129	167/235	71.1%
C	20/38	7/9	36/54	63/101	62.4%
L	40/72	20/30	92/131	152/233	65.2%
Ψ		24/30	100/131	124/161	77.0%
33	49/74	12/22	90/128	151/224	67.4%
579		20/30	78/127	98/157	62.4%
892	47/76	22/30	51/65	120/171	70.2%
Totals				875/1282	68.3%
Average Alexandrian				1453/2147	67.7%
CAESAREAN					
P^{45}			13/20	13/20	65.0%
Θ	45/75	17/30	87/129	149/234	63.7%
f^1	49/76	19/30	95/131	163/237	68.8%
f^{13}	42/76	20/30	89/131	151/237	63.7%
Totals				476/728	65.4%

Table 10 (cont.)

	Matthew	Luke	John	Totals	Avg.
BYZANTINE					
TR	43/76	20/30	91/131	154/237	65.0%
A	11/12	17/30	84/123	112/165	67.9%
E	46/76	18/29	88/131	152/236	64.4%
Δ	42/76	21/30	83/131	146/237	61.6%
Π	44/75	23/30	83/123	150/228	65.8%
Ω	46/76	18/28	88/130	152/234	65.0%
Totals				866/1337	64.8%
WESTERN					
ℵ* (Jn 1:1-8:38)			21/39	21/39	53.8%
D	26/62	9/29	61/121	96/212	45.3%
a	20/58	15/23	51/109	86/190	45.3%
b	23/59	12/22	53/108	88/189	46.6%
e	9/28	9/24	49/110	67/162	41.4%
k	9/25			9/25	36.0%
Totals				367/817	44.9%
OTHER MANUSCRIPTS AND WITNESSES					
W	43/76	19/30	69/112	131/218	60.1%
565	43/76	20/29	84/116	147/221	66.5%
700	43/76	21/30	87/131	151/237	63.7%
1071		18/30		18/30	60.0%
1241	36/58	19/30	84/128	139/216	64.4%
Clem	17/22	1/1	12/18	30/41	73.2%
Orig			53/68	53/68	77.9%
Did	9/11	3/6	21/34	33/51	64.7%

The bottom of Table 10 provides the combined results for witnesses that have unknown or mixed textual character. Comparing the witnesses listed at the bottom of Table 10 with other witnesses shows that Origen (77.9%) agrees with Athanasius more than any other witness (the next highest being Ψ = 77.0%).[55] Clement's agreement with Athanasius (73.2%) is third highest overall. ℵ^{c} is the fifth highest witness overall (behind Orig Ψ Clem UBS^{4}).[56] Athanasius' low level of agreement with Didymus' (64.7%) is somewhat surprising, especially given that Athanasius and Didymus were contemporaries in Alexandria. One should observe, however, that other Alexandrian witnesses, both Primary (P^{66} ℵ*) and Secondary (C 579), agree with Athanasius even less than Didymus does.

In conclusion, the quantitative analysis of Athanasius' text answers some questions, but raises others. The most clear result is that Athanasius' text is little affected by the Western text. The analysis also shows that Athanasius' text possibly favors the Alexandrian text, but

---

[55]It should be remembered that Athanasius' text was compared to Origen only in John. Further comparisons in Matthew and Luke might reduce this level of agreement.

[56]Throughout the three Gospels, Athanasius agrees with ℵ^{c} against ℵ* in twenty-three out of twenty-five significant units of variation. This increases Athanasius' level of agreement from 60.7% for ℵ* to 71.1% for ℵ^{c}, an increase of 10.4%.

this result is far from certain. On the one hand, Athanasius' text is closer to the Alexandrian group than any other group in every Gospel. On the other hand, the differences between Athanasius support of the Alexandrian group and his support of the other groups are not statistically significant. The individual witnesses that agree with Athanasius at the highest levels are predominantly Alexandrian.[57] Yet four Alexandrian witnesses (P^{66} $\aleph^{*}$ C 579) agree with Athanasius at levels lower than *all* of the Caesarean and *most* of the Byzantine witnesses. These observations raise the question as to whether Athanasius should be classified as an Alexandrian witness, and if so, how reliable of an Alexandrian witness is he? A group profile analysis will help to answer these questions.

---

[57]Five of the top six witnesses in level of agreement are clearly Alexandrian (Orig Ψ UBS^{4} $\aleph^{c}$ 892). Clement (ranked 3rd) might also be considered an Alexandrian witness. Following two non-Alexandrian witnesses (f^{1} A), the next three witnesses (ranked 9th-11th) are all Alexandrian (B 33 P^{75}) - for a total of eight (or nine) Alexandrians out of the top eleven.

CHAPTER 6

PROFILE ANALYSIS

Profile Methods

The quantitative analysis of Athanasius' text of the Gospels in the previous chapter raised questions concerning his being classified an Alexandrian witness. In order to determine more precisely how reliable or pure an Alexandrian witness Athanasius is, one must examine how well he preserves readings that characterize the Alexandrian group as well as the non-Alexandrian groups. A group profile analysis will accomplish this. Some of the profile methods that have been developed to classify manuscripts include "multiple readings,"[1] "test passages,"[2]

---

[1]Several studies have attempted to establish group profiles using variations of "triple" or "multiple readings." See E.A. Hutton, An Atlas of Textual Criticism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911); E.C. Colwell, "Method in Locating a Newly Discovered Manuscript," TU 73 (1959): 26-44; and Carroll Osburn, "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Hippolytus of Rome," *SecCent* 2 (1982): 97-124.

[2]Kurt and Barbara Aland developed a method to identify Byzantine manuscripts in the Catholic epistles based on a series of "test passages" (Teststellen). See K. Aland, Text und Textwert der grieschischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments, 3 vols. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987); and Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, The Text of the New Testament, 2nd ed. (Leiden: E.J. Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 106-7, 128, 317-37. The primary goal of their approach is to identify and thus exclude the bulk of Byzantine manuscripts which they feel have little value for

the Claremont Profile method,[3] and profiles designed for specific studies.[4] Each of these proposed methods lacks the comprehensiveness and sophistication needed to analyze thoroughly the text of a witness and to examine its group relationships.[5]

==========

reconstructing the original text. As far as classifying the remaining manuscripts the Alands hope the "test passages" will help to establish families and groups "where possible" and that the "tool we offer promises significant aid for this most difficult of tasks" (Text, 318). In the end, the Alands' categories for manuscripts are not based on textual relationships but on their value in reconstructing the history or transmission of the text (Text, 106-7).

[3]The Claremont Profile Method is one of the most recent and widely used profiles. This method was developed to permit quick classification of minuscules within the Byzantine tradition. For a description of this method see: Eldon J. Epp, "The Claremont Profile-Method for Grouping New Testament Minuscule Manuscripts," in Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament, SD 29, ed. Boyd L. Daniels and Jack M. Suggs (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967), 27-37; Paul McReynolds, "The Claremont Profile Method and the Grouping of Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts" (Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968); and Frederik Wisse, "The Claremont Profile Method for the Classification of the Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts: A Study in Method" (Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968) which was revised and updated in The Profile Method for Classifying and Evaluating Manuscript Evidence, SD 44 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

[4]Gordon Fee created a profile to analyze the text of Origen and Cyril in John, but the method is not easily extended to other types of witnesses (see G. Fee, "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria," *Bib* 52 (1971): 357-94.

[5]For example, the Claremont Profile method is an excellent tool for distinguishing between Byzantine manuscripts. W. Larry Richards has demonstrated that the Claremont Profile can also effectively distinguish between Byzantine and non-Byzantine manuscripts (see W. Larry

The most comprehensive and thorough profile method to date is the Comprehensive Group Profile Method developed by Bart Ehrman in his study of the Gospel text of Didymus.[6] The Comprehensive Group Profile examines three areas: (1) inter-group relationships, defined as a profile "concerned with readings characteristically preserved by witnesses of only one of the known textual groups," (2) intra-group relationships, defined as a profile "concerned with readings found extensively among members of a group, regardless of how well they are also attested by members of other groups," and (3) a combination profile that combines the results of the first two profiles and examines readings that are "supported by all or most representatives of a group (as determined by the intra-group profile) but by few or no other witnesses (as determined by the inter-group

==========

Richards, "Test Passages or Profiles: A Comparison of Two Text-Critical Methods," *JBL* 115 (1996), 251-269). But beyond distinguishing between Byzantine and non-Byzantine manuscripts, the Claremont Profile method is not sophisticated enough to determine the textual relationships of the non-Byzantine manuscripts. This can actually lead to misclassification of non-Byzantine witnesses. B. Ehrman observed that Wisse assigned manuscripts D and B to the same group (Didymus, 225).

For a brief overview and critique of the various profile methods see B. Ehrman, Didymus, 223-26. For a much more extensive evaluation, see B. Ehrman, "The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence," *JBL* 106 (1987): 465-86.

[6]Ehrman, Didymus, 226-253, 257-58. Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes will also use this method in their analysis of Origen's text of the Gospel of John (forthcoming).

profile)."[7] A witness's group relationship can be established by using these profiles to examine its preservation of readings both within a group and between groups. This profile is best suited to overcome the peculiarities, vagaries, and difficulties of evaluating patristic evidence.

Ehrman's profiles utilize a number of strictly defined categories which establish each particular reading's status. The following represent the categories used for each profile:[8]

I. Inter-group Relationships

A. Distinctive Readings - defined as readings that are unique to a particular group, i.e. readings that are shared by most group members and not found in any witness belonging to a different textual group. For the analysis of Athanasius' text, the distinctive group readings are defined as follows:[9]

1. Distinctively Alexandrian and Byzantine: Readings that are found in more than one-half of a

---

[7]Ehrman, Didymus, 226.

[8]The following definitions, with minor modifications, are taken from Ehrman, Didymus, 226-27.

[9]The following definitions of "distinctive readings" represent modifications of Ehrman's original definitions, but the modified definitions will be used by Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes in their forthcoming analysis of Origen's text of John.

particular group's members and no others.

2. Distinctively Caesarean:[10]

   Readings that are found in all the Caesarean witnesses and no others.[11]

---

[10]The questions surrounding the Caesarean text-type loom large - questions regarding its actual existence, which witnesses are members of this group and how well does each preserve the Caesarean text, and whether the Caesarean text is made up of two (or three) subgroups (e.g. a pre-Caesarean text represented by P^{45}, W^{Mk}, f^{1}, f^{13} and a Caesarean text proper represented by Θ, 565, and 700). For an excellent overview of the history of the study of the Caesarean text, see Bruce Metzger, Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism, NTTS 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), 42-72; and Larry Hurtado, Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark, SD 43 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981).

As suggested in the studies of Didymus (see Ehrman, Didymus, 19-20, 222) and Origen (see Ehrman, Fee, Holmes, Origen, 14-15, 29), I decided to collate all the major "Caesarean" witnesses, include them in the quantitative analysis, and include a "Caesarean Group" (composed of Θ f^{1} f^{13}) in the profile analysis in order to see if Athanasius provides any evidence for or against the existence of this textual group.

[11]In their forthcoming analysis of Origen's text of the Fourth Gospel, Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes will define a "distinctive Caesarean" reading as one found in more than one-half of all Caesarean witnesses and no others. For the Fourth Gospel, they consider P^{45} Θ f^{1} f^{13} 565 and 700 to be Caesarean witnesses. Following Ehrman's analysis of Didymus, I include only Θ f^{1} and f^{13} as Caesarean witnesses for all four Gospels (plus P^{45} where it is extant in John). Since I usually have only three Caesarean witnesses, the only way to distinguish between distinctive and exclusive Caesarean readings was to define distinctive readings as including all witnesses (i.e. three out of three) and exclusive readings as having the support of two witnesses (i.e. two out of three).

Most of the analysis of the Caesarean text and its representative witnesses has been done in the Gospel of Mark of which Athanasius preserves very little text. K. Lake and R.P. Blake showed that in Mark, Θ is closely

3. Distinctively Western:

   Readings found in at least one Greek Western witness, more than one-half of all Western witnesses, and no others. When the Old Latin witnesses cannot be used, then readings found in two Greek witnesses.

B. Exclusive Readings - defined as readings shared by at least two members of the same group and not supported by any witnesses belonging to the other groups. (This excludes readings already determined to be distinctive.)

==========

connected to f^1 f^{13} 28 565 and 700, closely enough to describe this group as a "family" (see K. Lake and R.P. Blake, "The Text of the Gospels and the Koridethi Codex," *HTR* 16 (1923): 267-86). B.H. Streeter, in his famous study of the origins of the four Gospels, named this group "family Θ" and extended Lake's conclusions concerning the relationship between these manuscripts in Mark to the other Gospels as well (see B.H. Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins (New York: MacMillan, 1925), 79-108 and 572-584; especially 82). Yet in the same study, Streeter himself admits that in the other Gospels (i.e. Mt, Lk, and Jn), 565 "suffered more from Byzantine revision than any other of the group" (Four Gospels, 574). Streeter's extension of "family Θ" to the other Gospels is based on a very limited set of examples. Since then, no systematic study of the texts of 565 and 700 outside of Mark have been done. Given the absence of firm evidence concerning the textual relationships of 565 and 700 and since I only had access to collations of 565 and 700 rather than continuous texts (as for f^1 and f^{13}), I decided not to include 565 and 700 as Caesarean witnesses for the profile analysis.

C. Primary Readings - defined as readings that are shared by at least two group members and have greater group support than non-group support. Greater group support is defined as follows:

1. Uniform Primary Readings - defined as readings that are shared by all group members, but that are neither supported uniformly by another group, nor predominantly by more than one other group, nor by more than two other groups when one of them supports the reading predominantly. (For "uniform" and "predominant" readings see the intra-group profile below.)
2. Predominant Primary Readings - defined as readings supported by over 60% of all witnesses of one group, but supported neither uniformly nor predominantly by any other group.
3. Primary Readings - defined as readings supported by a greater number of group witnesses than non-group witnesses.

II. Intra-Group Relationships

A. Uniform Readings - defined as readings shared by all witnesses of a group that contain the text.

B. Predominant Readings - defined as readings shared by over 60% of all witnesses of a group than contain the text.

Inter-Group Profile

If Athanasius is a good Alexandrian witness, then presumably he would preserve more readings that are characteristic of the Alexandrian group than those characteristic of other groups. Table 11 provides the frequency with which Athanasius supports distinctive, exclusive, and primary readings of each of the textual groups.

The figures confirm that Athanasius supports more distinctive Alexandrian readings than the distinctive readings of any other group. He preserves three out of seven distinctive Alexandrian readings (42.9%).[12] By

---

[12]Athanasius supports distinctive Alexandrian witnesses once in Lk 17:2 and twice in Jn 8:59. In Lk 17:2, he preserves a word order supported by all seven Alexandrian witnesses and no others. In Jn 8:59, Athanasius includes the clause και διελθων δια μεσου αυτων εποριευετο και παρηγεν ουτως along with all seven Secondary Alexandrian witnesses (ℵ^{c} C L Ψ 33 579 892; plus 1241). This clause is omitted by all five Primary Alexandrian witnesses (P^{66} P^{75} ℵ* B UBS^{4} as well as Clem). The clause is also omitted by all Western witnesses (D a b e) and one Caesarean witness (Θ). Within the clause, Athanasius agrees with two readings supported by all the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses against all six Byzantine witnesses and two Caesarean witnesses (f^{1} and f^{13}).

In four instances, Athanasius fails to preserve distinctive Alexandrian readings. In Mt 18:6, he reads εις τον τραχηλον against all other Alexandrian witnesses which read περι τον τραχηλον. In Mt 19:5, he reads ενεκεν (along with C 33 892) against four Alexandrian witnesses (ℵ B L UBS^{4}) that read ενεκα. In this case, one could argue that he preserves a Secondary Alexandrian reading against a Primary Alexandrian reading. In Mt 26:45, Athanasius includes the article το (along with ℵ and UBS^{4}) against four Alexandrian witnesses that omit the article (B C L

comparison, Athanasius preserves only one of five distinctive Byzantine readings (20.0%),[13] he does not support the lone Caesarean distinctive reading,[14] and most dramatically, he fails to preserve any of the twenty-four distinctive Western readings![15] These statistics reveal that Athanasius preserves a distinctively Alexandrian form of the text more than he preserves any other textual form. They also confirm the results of the quantitative analysis that Athanasius' text displays little affinity to the Western text.

==========

892; 33 lac.). In Lk 23:45, Athanasius supports εσκοτισθη (along with Ψ 892 and C^{c}) against seven Alexandrian witnesses (P^{75*} ℵ B C^{*vid} L 579 UBS^{4}) which read εκλιποντος and 33 which omits the clause entirely. In this case, Athanasius preserves a reading supported by Secondary Alexandrian witnesses but not any Primary Alexandrians.

[13]Athanasius does not preserve the distinctive Byzantine readings found in Mt 12:14 (word order), Mt 22:30 (word substitution; Byz = εκγαμιζονται), Jn 6:40 (word substitution; Byz = πεμψαντος με), or Jn 17:19b (word order). The lone distinctive Byzantine reading that Athanasius preserves is found in Mt 24:18 where he supports τα ιματια (along with E Δ Ω TR) against all other witnesses (including one Byzantine witness - Π) which read το ιματιον.

[14]The lone distinctive Caesarean reading is found in Mt 26:45, where two of three Caesarean witnesses (Θ and f^{1}) read ηγγικεν γαρ against ιδου γαρ ηγγικεν (Ath B E) and ιδου ηγγικεν (rell).

[15]Distinctive Western readings are found in the following texts: Mt 10:18; 10:29; 11:28; 12:14; 19:6; 24:3; 24:17; 28:19; Lk 12:20(2X); 24:1; 24:40; Jn 1:13; 5:18; 5:19; 6:30; 6:38; 6:39; 6:46; 8:58; 9:39; 10:35; 10:38; 17:18.

Table 11

Athanasius' Attestation of Inter-Group Readings

	Distinctive	Exclusive	Primary	Totals
Matthew				
Alexandrian	0/3	0/1	8/11	8/15 (53.3%)
Byzantine	1/3	0/0	1/11	2/14 (14.3%)
Caesarean	0/1	0/1	5/11	5/13 (38.5%)
Western	0/8	1/16	2/7	3/31 (9.7%)
Mark				
Alexandrian	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0 (-----)
Byzantine	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/1 (0.0%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0 (-----)
Western	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0 (-----)
Luke				
Alexandrian	1/2	0/0	5/9	6/11 (54.5%)
Byzantine	0/0	0/1	1/3	1/4 (25.0%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/0	2/5	2/5 (40.0%)
Western	0/4	0/4	1/2	1/10 (10.0%)
John				
Alexandrian	2/2	1/11	5/15	8/28 (28.6%)
Byzantine	0/2	2/3	5/13	7/18 (38.9%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/3	3/6	3/9 (33.3%)
Western	0/12	2/16	3/19	5/47 (10.6%)
Totals				
Alexandrian	3/7 (42.9%)	1/12 (8.3%)	18/35 (51.4%)	22/54 (40.7%)
Byzantine	1/5 (20.0%)	2/4 (50.0%)	7/28 (23.3%)	10/37 (27.0%)
Caesarean	0/1 (0.0%)	0/4 (0.0%)	10/22 (45.5%)	10/27 (37.0%)
Western	0/24 (0.0%)	3/36 (8.3%)	6/28 (21.4%)	9/88 (10.2%)

Athanasius' support of the Alexandrian text is not as conclusive for exclusive readings. Overall, he preserves very few exclusive readings from any group - only one of the twelve exclusive Alexandrian readings (8.3%),[16] two of the four exclusive Byzantine readings (50.0%),[17] none of the four exclusive Caesarean readings (0.0%),[18] and three of the thirty-six exclusive Western readings (8.3%).[19] The low level of preservation of exclusive Alexandrian readings is explained by the definition itself of an exclusive reading.

==========

[16]The lone exclusive Alexandrian reading that Athanasius preserves is found in Jn 9:39 where he reads εληλυθα (with P^{75} 579 892) against ηλθον (rell). He does not preserve exclusive Alexandrian readings in eleven places - Mt 26:45 and Jn 1:18; 10:38; 12:46; 14:10; 14:29; 16:15; 17:5; 17:17; 17:22; 19:39.

[17]Athanasius preserves exclusive Byzantine readings found in Jn 12:13, where he reads απαντησιν (along with A Π as well as Orig) against συναντησιν (D L f^{13} 1241) and υπαντησιν (rell), and in Jn 14:28, where he supports οτι ειπον (along with E Δ Ω TR plus 700) against οτι εγω (f^{13} and e) and οτι (rell). He does not preserve exclusive Byzantine readings found in Lk 22:30 and Jn 16:13.

[18]Athanasius fails to preserve the exclusive Caesarean readings found in Mt 22:30 and Jn 7:30; 11:54; 12:34.

[19]Athanasius preserves exclusive Western readings in Mt 24:17 where he reads και ο επι (with a and b plus 700 and Clem) against ο δε επι (D 33 e) and ο επι (rell); Jn 5:39 where he reads αυται (with b and e plus W and Did) against εκειναι (rell); and Jn 12:32 where he reads οταν (with a and e plus 1241) against αν (B) and εαν (rell). Athanasius fails to preserve exclusive Western readings in the following verses: Mt 6:26; 6:27; 6:28; 10:18; 10:29; 12:28; 18:6; 18:19; 18:20; 24:18; 25:35; 26:45; 26:64; 28:19(2X); Lk 2:28; 22:29; 22:30; 24:39; Jn 1:12; 1:13(2X); 1:18; 5:39; 6:39(2X); 7:30; 10:36; 14:10; 14:23(2X); 17:3; 17:22.

For a reading to qualify as an exclusive Alexandrian reading, it must have the support of at least two Alexandrian witnesses, but fewer than one-half of all the Alexandrian witnesses, and no others. Athanasius supports the reading found in the majority of Alexandrian witnesses in eight of the eleven places where he fails to preserve an exclusive Alexandrian reading.[20] His higher level of preservation of Byzantine exclusive readings can be attributed to the low number of samples. Once again, Athanasius' infrequent support of the large number of exclusive Western readings shows his distance from the Western text.

Athanasius' support of primary readings swings back to the Alexandrian text. He preserves eighteen of thirty-five primary Alexandrian readings (51.4%),[21] seven of

==========

[20]He preserves the reading of the majority of the Alexandrian witnesses against an exclusive Alexandrian reading in Mt 26:45 and Jn 10:38; 12:46; 14:29; 16:15; 17:5; 17:17; 19:39 In Jn 1:18, Athanasius supports the reading found in three Alexandrian witnesses (Ψ 579 892) against an exclusive reading found in two Alexandrians (P^{75} 33 plus $\aleph^{c}$) and against a primary reading found in five Alexandrians (P^{66} B C L UBS^{4}). In Jn 14:10, he preserves the reading found in two Alexandrian witnesses (Ψ 892) against an exclusive reading found in four Alexandrians (P^{75} L 33 579) and against a primary reading found in four Alexandrians (P^{66} ℵ B UBS^{4}). In Jn 17:22, he preserves the reading found in one Alexandrian witness (Ψ plus $\aleph^{c}$) against an exclusive reading found in two Alexandrians ($\aleph^{*}$ 579) and against a primary reading found in six Alexandrians (P^{66} B C L 33 UBS^{4}).

[21]Athanasius preserves primary Alexandrian readings in the

twenty-eight primary Byzantine readings (25.0%),[22] ten of twenty-two primary Caesarean readings (45.5%),[23] and six of twenty-eight primary Western readings (21.4%).[24] These figures confirm the previous findings.

Examination of the "Totals" column of Table 11 reveals two significant points. The first point of interest comes from comparing the totals columns for each of the Gospels. In Matthew and Luke, Athanasius preserves over 50% of all the Alexandrian readings. In John, this percentage drops to only 28.6%. His preservation of Byzantine readings

---

following passages: Mt 8:29; 10:23; 18:19; 19:5; 22:30; 24:15; 24:17(2X); Lk 1:2; 2:28; 10:18; 24:39; 24:40; Jn 5:36; 10:38; 11:47; 14:10; 17:22. He fails to support primary Alexandrian readings in Mt 6:25; 12:14; 24:3; Lk 1:27; 22:30; 24:39(2x); Jn 1:18; 3:17; 5:39; 11:47; 12:34; 14:10; 14:28; 16:13; 17:4; 17:22.

[22]Athanasius preserves primary Byzantine readings in Mt 14:12; Lk 24:39; Jn 6:46; 8:59; 14:23; 14:28; 16:25. He does not preserve primary Byzantine readings in Mt 6:25; 6:28(3X); 9:36; 10:23; 13:25; 18:19; 24:16; 24:17; Mk 2:11; Lk 8:52; 24:40; Jn 5:36; 6:40; 6:63; 10:38; 11:53; 11:54; 12:34; 16:13.

[23]Athanasius preserves primary Caesarean readings in Mt 9:36; 12:14; 13:25; 18:6; 19:4; Lk 1:27; 1:35; Jn 11:53; 14:30; 16:13. He fails to preserve primary Caesarean readings in Mt 10:23; 18:19; 19:5(2X); 22:30; 24:15; Lk 8:52; 22:29; 24:39; Jn 5:18; 10:38; 17:22.

[24]Athanasius preserves primary Western readings in Mt 6:25; 22:30; Lk 21:8; and Jn 6:40; 8:35; 18:5. He fails to preserve primary Western readings in Mt 6:25; 6:30; 12:14; 18:6; 24:17; Lk 24:39; Jn 1:3; 6:38; 6:46; 7:30; 8:59; 10:33; 10:38; 11:47(2X); 11:54; 12:32; 12:46; 14:9; 16:25; 17:19; 17:21.

increases from 14.3% in Matthew and 25.0% in Luke to 38.9% in the Gospel of John.[25] His decreased preservation of Alexandrian readings and his increased preservation of Byzantine readings in the Gospel of John helps to explain why the quantitative analysis of Athanasius' text is less conclusive for John than it is for Matthew and Luke.

The second point of interest concerns overall percentages. These reveal that Athanasius preserves a greater percentage of specifically Alexandrian readings (40.7%) than any other group - 27.0% of the Byzantine readings, 37.0% of the Caesarean readings, and only 10.2% of the Western readings. These values point out that Athanasius has the closest textual affinity to the Alexandrian group, followed by the Caesarean group, then the Byzantine group, and finally the Western group. His infrequent preservation of specifically Western readings indicates that he was little influenced by the Western tradition.

---

[25]Athanasius' preservation of Caesarean readings remains fairly constant throughout the three Gospels - 38.5% in Matthew, 40.0% in Luke, and 33.3% in John. Athanasius' preservation of Western readings remains consistently around 10% for all three Gospels.

Intra-Group Profile

Just as one would expect Athanasius to preserve a higher percentage of specifically Alexandrian readings, so too one would expect him to preserve a higher percentage of readings shared by all or a majority of Alexandrian witnesses regardless of how well those readings are supported by members of other textual groups. Table 12 provides the percentages of Athanasius' attestation of uniform and predominant readings for all the textual groups. The results of the intra-group profile once again confirm that Athanasius' textual affinities are closest to the Alexandrian text.

One of the most impressive figures in Table 12 is Athanasius' attestation of uniform Alexandrian readings. When all three Gospels are considered together, he preserves 89.0% of the uniform Alexandrian readings. This percentage drops significantly for his attestation of uniform Caesarean readings (79.6%), uniform Byzantine readings (72.7%), and especially uniform Western readings (only 44.1%).[26] These values point out that Athanasius has

---

[26]Athanasius can be compared with the other representatives of the Alexandrian text-type by collating each Alexandrian witness against all other Alexandrian witnesses (excluding Athanasius of course) to determine the degree which they support uniform Alexandrian readings. Such collations show that most of the other Alexandrian witnesses preserve higher percentages of uniform Alexandrian readings than Athanasius does. There are a few

the closest textual affinity to the Alexandrian group, followed by the Caesarean, then Byzantine, and lastly Western groups.

One would expect Athanasius' attestation of predominant readings to drop in comparison to his support of uniform readings. Whenever he preserves an exclusive or primary reading of a group, he often disagrees with the majority reading of that group (which is frequently a predominant reading also). The percentages in Table 12 confirm this expectation. For each group, Athanasius' attestation of predominant readings is lower than his attestation of uniform readings. Athanasius preserves a significantly greater percentage of Alexandrian predominant readings than the predominant readings of any other group. He supports 71.3% of the predominant Alexandrian readings, 52.8% of the predominant Caesarean readings, 47.8% of the predominant Byzantine readings, and 40.0% of the predominant Western readings. These figures once again

---

exceptions. In the Fourth Gospel, Athanasius preserves a higher percentage (90.3%) of uniform Alexandrian readings than P^{66} (79.4%), Ψ (86.1%), or 579 (86.1%). In Luke, he preserves a higher percentage (100.0%) of uniform Alexandrian readings than Ψ (91.7%), 579 (84.6%), or 892 (91.7%). Over all three Gospels, he preserves a higher percentage of uniform Alexandrian readings (89.0%) than both P^{66} (79.4%) and Ψ (87.5%) and just below the percentages of 579 (91.3%) and ℵ 33 892 (all 94.7%). This shows that while Athanasius is not a primary Alexandrian witness, he is at least a moderately reliable Alexandrian witness (as good as P^{66} Ψ and 579).

Table 12

Athanasius' Attestation of Intra-Group Uniform and Predominant Readings

	Uniform		Predominant		Totals	
Matthew						
Alex	26/31	(83.9%)	13/20	(65.0%)	39/51	(76.5%)
Byz	28/43	(65.1%)	4/8	(50.0%)	32/51	(62.7%)
Caes	26/32	(81.3%)	11/24	(45.8%)	37/56	(66.1%)
West	7/19	(36.8%)	2/15	(13.3%)	9/34	(26.5%)
Mark						
Alex	0/0	(-----)	1/1	(100.0%)	1/1	(100.0%)
Byz	0/1	(0.0%)	0/0	(-----)	0/1	(0.0%)
Caes	0/0	(-----)	1/1	(100.0%)	1/1	(100.0%)
West	1/1	(100.0%)	0/0	(-----)	1/1	(100.0%)
Luke						
Alex	11/11	(100.0%)	8/13	(61.5%)	19/24	(79.2%)
Byz	13/19	(66.7%)	5/9	(55.6%)	18/28	(64.3%)
Caes	14/21	(66.7%)	3/7	(42.9%)	17/28	(60.7%)
West	5/10	(50.0%)	3/5	(60.0%)	8/15	(53.3%)
John						
Alex	28/31	(90.3%)	40/53	(75.5%)	68/84	(81.0%)
Byz	52/65	(80.0%)	13/29	(44.8%)	65/94	(69.1%)
Caes	46/55	(83.6%)	23/40	(57.5%)	69/95	(72.6%)
West	13/29	(44.8%)	13/25	(52.0%)	26/54	(48.1%)
Totals						
Alex	65/73	(89.0%)	62/87	(71.3%)	127/160	(79.4%)
Byz	93/128	(72.7%)	22/46	(47.8%)	115/174	(66.1%)
Caes	86/108	(79.6%)	38/72	(52.8%)	124/180	(68.9%)
West	26/59	(44.1%)	18/45	(40.0%)	44/104	(42.3%)

confirm that Athanasius is a fairly reliable Alexandrian witness, that his text is slightly closer to the Caesarean text than the Byzantine text, and that his text shows little influence from the Western text.

When Athanasius' attestation of uniform readings and predominant readings are combined, his textual affinity becomes clear. He preserves a higher percentage of uniform and predominant Alexandrian readings (79.4%) than any other group (Byzantine = 66.1%; Caesarean = 68.9%; and Western = 42.3%).

When considered together, the results of the inter-group and intra-group profiles clearly demonstrate both the Alexandrian tendencies and non-Western character of Athanasius' text of the Gospels. It also appears that he is more closely aligned to the Caesarean text than the Byzantine text, but this observation is statistically less certain. The intra-group profile also hints that while being a solid Alexandrian witness, Athanasius is not one of the better Alexandrian witnesses.

Combined Inter- and Intra-Group Profile

The intra-group profile has a major weakness. The large number of distinctive and exclusive Western readings (i.e. readings that are supported by two or more Western witnesses but no others) artificially raises Athanasius'

level of support of non-Western uniform and predominant readings.[27] This weakness can be counteracted by combining the intra-group profile with the inter-group profile.[28] A combination of the two profiles provides Athanasius' attestation of readings that are supported by at least two-thirds of the members of a particular group but by few (or no) members of other groups. This eliminates the inflated numbers of uniform and predominant readings found in the non-Western groups since those readings are supported by more than one group. The combined profile still calculates, however, his attestation of readings that are relatively isolated to a two-thirds majority of a particular group. The results of this profile analysis are found in Table 13. This table provides Athanasius'

---

[27]Looking at Table 11, one can observe that there are a total of sixty distinctive and exclusive Western readings compared to only nineteen Alexandrian, nine Byzantine, and five Caesarean. Athanasius preserves only three of these sixty distinctive/ exclusive Western readings (Mt 24:17; Jn 5:39; Jn 12:32). Obviously in these three instances, Athanasius does not support any other group's reading. In the remaining fifty-seven readings, Athanasius preserves fifty uniform/predominant Alexandrian readings, fifty-two Byzantine uniform/predominant readings, and fifty-one uniform/predominant Caesarean readings. This shows the degree to which the presence of the Western distinctive/exclusive readings inflates Athanasius' attestation of non-Western uniform/predominant readings. Of course, the same phenomenon holds true for the other groups' distinctive/ exclusive readings, but to a lesser degree than the Western.

[28]The value of the combined profile is briefly discussed by Ehrman in Didymus, 237-38.

Table 13

Athanasius' Support of Uniform and Predominant Readings That Are Also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary

	Uniform	Predominant	Totals
Alexandrian			
Matthew	5/6 (83.3%)	3/5 (60.0%)	8/11 (72.7%)
Mark	0/0 (-----)	0/0 (-----)	0/0 (-----)
Luke	1/1 (100.0%)	2/3 (66.7%)	3/4 (75.0%)
John	3/3 (100.0%)	2/4 (50.0%)	5/7 (71.4%)
Totals	9/10 (90.0%)	7/12 (58.3%)	16/22 (72.7%)
Byzantine			
Matthew	1/11 (9.1%)	1/3 (33.3%)	2/14 (14.3%)
Mark	0/1 (0.0%)	0/0 (-----)	0/1 (0.0%)
Luke	1/2 (50.0%)	0/1 (0.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)
John	5/8 (62.5%)	1/7 (14.3%)	6/15 (40.0%)
Totals	7/22 (31.8%)	2/11 (18.2%)	9/33 (27.3%)
Caesarean			
Matthew	1/2 (50.0%)	4/11 (36.4%)	5/13 (38.5%)
Mark	0/0 (-----)	0/0 (-----)	0/0 (-----)
Luke	1/2 (50.0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	2/5 (40.0%)
John	0/0 (-----)	3/8 (37.5%)	3/8 (37.5%)
Totals	2/4 (50.0%)	8/22 (36.4%)	10/26 (38.5%)
Western			
Matthew	1/9 (11.1%)	1/12 (8.3%)	2/21 (9.5%)
Mark	0/0 (-----)	0/0 (-----)	0/0 (-----)
Luke	1/5 (20.0%)	0/1 (0.0%)	1/6 (16.7%)
John	1/15 (6.7%)	2/12 (16.7%)	3/27 (11.1%)
Totals	3/29 (10.3%)	3/25 (12.0%)	6/54 (11.1%)

attestation of uniform and exclusive readings that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary (hereafter, d/e/p).

Before evaluating the data, one preliminary observation is necessary. By combining the two profiles, the number of sample readings is greatly reduced. Comparing Table 12 with Table 13, the number of Alexandrian uniform and predominant readings drops from 160 to 22, Byzantine readings from 174 to 33, Caesarean readings from 180 to 26, and Western readings from 104 to 54. The decrease in Western readings is not as great as the other groups because a larger percentage of the Western uniform and predominant readings are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary. These numbers show that the combination of the two profiles does in fact deflate the exaggerated number of non-Western uniform and predominant readings.

This profile clearly shows Athanasius' affinity to the Alexandrian text. He supports 90.0% of the Alexandrian uniform d/e/p readings.[29] He supports only 50.0% of the Caesarean,[30] 31.8% of the Byzantine,[31] and 10.3% of the

---

[29]Athanasius supports the Alexandrian uniform readings found in Mt 8:29; 10:23; 18:19; 24:15; 24:17; Lk 17:2; Jn 8:59(2X); 11:47. He does not preserve the Alexandrian uniform reading found in Mt 18:6.

[30]Athanasius supports the Caesarean uniform reading found in Mt 18:6. He does not preserve the Caesarean uniform readings found in Mt 24:15 and Lk 24:39.

[31]Athanasius supports the Byzantine uniform readings found in Mt 14:12; Jn 6:46; 8:59; 14:23; 16:25. He does not

Western.[32] A similar disparity in support is evident among the predominant d/e/p readings. He supports 58.3% of the Alexandrian,[33] 36.4% of the Caesarean,[34] 18.2% of the Byzantine,[35] and 12.0% of the Western.[36] When the uniform and predominant readings are considered together, the results show without question that Athanasius supports the Alexandrian text much better than any other group. He supports the Alexandrian uniform and predominant d/e/p

==========

preserve the Byzantine uniform readings found in Mt 6:25; 6:28(3X); 9:36; 10:23; 13:25; 18:19; 22:30; 24:17; Mk 2:11; Lk 24:40; Jn 5:36; 11:53; 11:54.

[32]Athanasius supports the Western uniform readings found in Mt 6:25; Lk 21:8; Jn 18:5. He does not preserve the Western uniform readings found in Mt 6:27; 6:28; 6:30; 10:18; 10:29; 11:28; 12:14; 24:3; Lk 12:20; 24:1; 24:39; 24:40; Jn 1:3; 5:18; 6:46(2X); 8:58; 8:59; 10:53; 10:38(2X); 11:47; 11:54; 12:32; 16:25; 17:21.

[33]Athanasius supports the Alexandrian predominant readings found in Mt 19:5; 22:30; 24:17; Lk 24:39; 24:40; Jn 5:36; 17:22; He does not preserve the Alexandrian predominant readings found in Mt 12:14; 26:45; Lk 23:45; Jn 17:4.

[34]Athanasius supports the Caesarean predominant readings found in Mt 9:36; 12:14; 19:6; Lk 1:35; Jn 11:53. He does not preserve the Caesarean predominant readings found in Mt 10:23; 18:19; 19:5; 22:30(2X); 26:45; Lk 8:52; 22:29; Jn 5:18; 7:30; 10:38; 12:34; 17:22.

[35]Athanasius supports the Byzantine predominant readings found in Mt 24:18 and Jn 14:28. He does not preserve the Byzantine predominant readings found in Mt 12:14; 24:16; Lk 8:52; Jn 6:40(2X); 6:63; 10:38; 16:13; 17:19.

[36]Athanasius supports the Western predominant readings found in Mt 22:30 and Jn 18:5. He does not preserve the Western predominant readings found in Mt 6:25; 6:26; 10:18; 18:20; 19:6; 24:17; 25:35; 26:45; 26:64; 28:19(2X); Lk 12:20; Jn 5:19; 6:38; 9:39; 10:36; 11:47(2X); 12:46; 17:18.

readings a total of 72.7% as compared to only 38.5% of such Caesarean readings, 27.3% of the Byzantine, and a mere 11.1% of the Western. Athanasius support of the Alexandrian group is nearly twice that of the next closest group.

The inter-group profile (see Table 11), the intra-group profile (see Table 12), and especially the combined profile (see Table 13) clearly indicate that Athanasius should be classified as an Alexandrian witness. One question that remains is, how "pure" or "reliable" is Athanasius' text as an Alexandrian witness?[37] A comparison of Athanasius' support of Alexandrian uniform and predominant d/e/p readings with other witnesses' support of the same readings will help evaluate how "good" of an Alexandrian witness he is. For the Alexandrian uniform readings, it is not necessary to include the other Alexandrian witnesses in the calculations since by definition they will support these readings 100%. Table 14 ranks Athanasius and the non-Alexandrian witnesses according to their proportional support of Alexandrian uniform d/e/p readings.

==========

[37]In the intra-group profile above, a comparison is made between Athanasius and the other Alexandrian witnesses to determine the degree which they preserve uniform Alexandrian readings (see footnote 26 above). The results of this comparison indicated that he is not one of the stronger Alexandrian witnesses.

Table 14

Witnesses Ranked According to Their Support of Alexandrian Uniform Distinctive/Exclusive/Primary Readings (Alexandrian Witnesses Excluded)

1.	Ath	9/10	90.0%[38]
2.	W	3/9	33.3%
3.	a	2/6	33.3%
4.	A	1/4	25.0%
4.	Θ	2/8	25.0%
4.	1241	2/8	25.0%
7.	565	2/9	22.2%
8.	Π	2/10	20.0%
8.	700	2/10	20.0%
8.	TR	2/10	20.0%
11.	b	1/6	16.7%
12.	D	1/7	14.3%
13.	E	1/10	10.0%
13.	Δ	1/10	10.0%
13.	Ω	1/10	10.0%
13.	f^1	1/10	10.0%
17.	e	0/3	0.0%
18.	f^{13}	0/10	0.0%

Athanasius' level of support (90.0%) is substantially higher than any of the non-Alexandrian witnesses (the next closest witnesses are W and a at 33.3%). This confirms

==========

[38]Five witnesses preserve 100.0% of the Alexandrian uniform dist/excl/prim readings (P^{45} = 1/1; k = 2/2; Clem = 2/2; Orig = 1/1; Did = 1/1), but the low number of readings they preserve makes their testimony suspect.

that Athanasius is a much better supporter of Alexandrian readings than any of the non-Alexandrian witnesses.

For Alexandrian predominant d/e/p readings, Athanasius' support can be compared to other Alexandrian witnesses as well as non-Alexandrian witnesses because the category "predominant Alexandrian" indicates a split among the Alexandrian witnesses. Table 15 ranks all the witnesses' support of Alexandrian predominant d/e/p readings. Table 15 indicates that ten out of eleven Alexandrian witnesses (P^{66} P^{75} C B L 579 ℵ UBS^4 892 33) preserve a higher percentage of Alexandrian predominant d/e/p readings than does Athanasius. Only Ψ preserves a lower percentage. This indicates that compared to the other Alexandrian witnesses, Athanasius is not one of the more reliable or purer witnesses. On the other hand, with the exception of f^1 and Clem,[39] Athanasius preserves a higher percentage of Alexandrian predominant d/e/p readings than the rest of the non-Alexandrian witnesses (the next closest witnesses being W and b at 50.0%, then dropping to

---

[39]That f^1 preserves a higher percentage of predominant Alexandrian readings (66.7% = 8/12) than Athanasius (58.3% = 7/12) is not altogether surprising given the close alignment between Athanasius and f^1 as seen in the quantitative analysis. Again, this can be attributed to a fairly strong Alexandrian element in f^1. Clement often preserves an Alexandrian form of the text, which might explain his higher percentage, but he also provides text for very few predominant readings (2/3), which might artificially raise his level of support.

Table 15

Witnesses Ranked According to Their Support of Alexandrian Predominant Distinctive/Exclusive/Primary Readings

1.	P^{66}	4/4	100.0%
	P^{75}	4/4	100.0%
	C	7/7	100.0%
4.	B	11/12	91.7%
	L	11/12	91.7%
6.	UBS^{4}	10/12	83.3%
7.	892	7/9	77.8%
8.	ℵ	9/12	75.0%
9.	33	8/11	72.7%
10.	579	5/7	71.4%
11.	f^{1}	8/12	66.7%
	Clem	2/3	66.7%
13.	Ath	7/12	58.3%
14.	W	6/12	50.0%
	b	4/8	50.0%
16.	D	4/11	36.4%
	565	4/11	36.4%
	1241	4/11	36.4%
19.	e	2/7	26.8%
20.	A	2/8	25.0%
	Π	3/12	25.0%
22.	Δ	2/12	16.7%
	Ω	2/12	16.7%
	700	2/12	16.7%
25.	Ψ	1/7	14.3%
26.	a	1/8	12.5%
27.	f^{13}	1/12	8.3%
	TR	1/12	8.3%
29.	E	0/12	0.0%
	Θ	0/12	0.0%
	1071	0/3	0.0%
	k	0/1	0.0%

D 565 and 1241 at 36.4%). Considering all of the data of the Combined Profile together, the results are conclusive - Athanasius' text should be classified as Alexandrian, but he is not one of the stronger Alexandrian witnesses.

Primary or Secondary Alexandrian?

There exists one more important question concerning the nature of Athanasius' text. The profile analysis has revealed Athanasius to be an Alexandrian witness, but it has not determined whether he is best grouped with the "Primary Alexandrian" or "Secondary Alexandrian" witnesses.[40] The quantitative analysis indicates that his text is closer to the Primary Alexandrian witnesses in Matthew (and possibly Luke - see Tables 3 and 6) but closer to the Secondary Alexandrians in John (see Table 9). Overall, his agreement with representatives from each of these sub-groups differs by less than 1% (see Table 10).[41]

---

[40]The Alexandrian witnesses have typically been divided into at least two sub-groups. Bruce Metzger's textbook popularized the designations "Proto-Alexandrian" and "Later Alexandrian," a vast improvement over Westcott and Hort's misnomers "Neutral" and "Alexandrian" (see Metzger, Text, 131-34, 215-16). In his study of Didymus' text of the Gospels, Ehrman suggested that the labels "Primary" and "Secondary Alexandrian" might be more appropriate designations since they refer to a witness's preservation of the purest form of text in Alexandria, rather than temporal considerations (see Didymus, 265-66).

[41]Since UBS[4] is not, technically speaking, a true Primary Alexandrian witness, if it were removed Athanasius' overall

The profile analysis does not help determine Athanasius' affinity to either of the two Alexandrian sub-groups because it groups all the Alexandrian witnesses together.

One way to determine Athanasius' alignment to the two Alexandrian sub-groups is to examine variants in which the Alexandrian witnesses split their support along sub-group lines. In other words, if the Alexandrian sub-groups are treated as distinct textual groups when determining distinctive, exclusive, and primary readings as well as uniform and predominant readings, then Athanasius' alignment to the two sub-groups can be measured..

Table 16 provides Athanasius attestation of distinctive, exclusive and primary readings when the Alexandrian witnesses are split into Primary and Secondary Alexandrian subgroups.[42] The table shows that there is

==========

support of the Primary Alexandrian group decreases from 68.6% to 65.1% (= 410/630). This would cause the difference between his support of the Secondary Alexandrians (67.6%) and the Primary Alexandrians to increase to 2.5%. Even if UBS[4] were removed, however, Athanasius would still be closer to the Primary Alexandrian group in Matthew (at 64.5% = 98/152) and Luke (at 70.4% = 57/81).

[42]A few things should be noted about Table 16. Dividing the Alexandrian group into two sub-groups does not affect the number of non-Alexandrian distinctive and exclusive readings (cf. Table 11). Dividing the Alexandrian witnesses does change the number of non-Alexandrian primary readings. For example, in Mt 9:36, when the Alexandrian witnesses are considered as one group, it creates both a primary Caesarean reading and a primary Byzantine reading. When the Alexandrians are split into two sub-groups, the

little difference in Athanasius' support of the two sub-groups in Matthew or Luke. His support of the Primary Alexandrian sub-group decreases in John to a level below his support of the Byzantine readings. His support of the Secondary Alexandrian readings in John is significantly higher than his support of readings from any other group.[43] The overall totals indicate that he supports the Secondary Alexandrian sub-group (42.9%) more than the Primary Alexandrian sub-group (3.4%), and that he supports both Alexandrian sub-groups more than he supports any other

==========

Primary Alexandrians support the Byzantine reading uniformly and the Secondary Alexandrians support the Caesarean reading predominantly, thus eliminating both primary readings. (Are you confused yet?)

[43]There are no Primary Alexandrian distinctive readings. There are two Secondary Alexandrian distinctive readings (found in Jn 8:59 where the Primary Alexandrian witnesses omit a portion of the text), and Athanasius preserves both of them. He fails to preserve any of the three Primary Alexandrian exclusive readings (Jn 12:46b; 16:15; 19:39b). Nor does he preserve either of the two Secondary Alexandrian exclusive readings (Mt 26:45 and Jn 14:29). The Primary Alexandrian primary readings (not to be confused with the secondary Secondary Alexandrian readings!) include (an * indicates that Athanasius supports that reading):

Mt *10:23; 12:14; 19:5; Lk 1:27; *2:28; *10:18; 22:30; 23:45; *24:39; 24:39; *24:40; Jn 1:13; 1:18; 3:17; 5:39; *10:38; *11:53; *14:10; 14:10.

The Secondary Alexandrian primary readings (or is that Primary secondary?) include:

Mt *19:5; 24:3; *24:17; 26:45; Lk *1:2; 24:39; Jn *9:39; 11:47; 14:10; 14:28.

Table 16

Athanasius Attestation of Inter-Group Readings
(Alexandrian Witnesses Split between Primary and Secondary)

	Distinctive	Exclusive	Primary	Totals
Matthew				
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/0	1/3	1/3 (33.3%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/1	2/4	2/5 (40.0%)
Byzantine	1/3	0/0	1/8	2/11 (18.2%)
Caesarean	0/1	0/1	4/10	4/12 (33.3%)
Western	0/8	1/16	2/7	3/31 (9.7%)
Mark				
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0 (-----)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0 (-----)
Byzantine	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/1 (0.0%)
Luke				
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/0	4/8	4/8 (50.0%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0	0/0	1/2	1/2 (50.0%)
Byzantine	0/0	0/1	0/2	0/3 (0.0%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/0	1/4	1/4 (40.0%)
Western	0/4	0/4	1/2	1/10 (10.0%)
John				
Prim. Alex.	0/0	0/3	3/8	3/11 (27.3%)
Sec. Alex.	2/2	0/1	1/4	3/7 (42.9%)
Byzantine	0/2	2/3	3/10	5/15 (33.3%)
Caesarean	0/0	0/3	2/5	2/8 (25.0%)
Western	0/12	2/16	3/16	5/44 (11.4%)
Totals				
Prim. Alex.	0/0 (----)	0/3 (0.0%)	8/19 (42.1%)	8/22 (36.4%)
Sec. Alex.	2/2 (100.0%)	0/2 (0.0%)	4/10 (40.0%)	6/14 (42.9%)
Byzantine	1/5 (20.0%)	2/4 (50.0%)	4/21 (19.0%)	7/30 (23.3%)
Caesarean	0/1 (0.0%)	0/4 (0.0%)	7/19 (36.8%)	7/24 (29.2%)
Western	0/24 (0.0%)	3/36 (8.3%)	6/25 (24.0%)	9/85 (10.6%)

group (Caesarean = 29.2%; Byzantine = 23.3%; Western = 10.6%).

Table 17 provides Athanasius' support of uniform and predominant readings when the Alexandrian witnesses are divided into Primary and Secondary sub-groups.[44] In Matthew, Athanasius preserves a higher percentage of Primary Alexandrian readings (76.6%) than Secondary Alexandrian readings (66.7%). In Luke and John, he preserves a higher percentage of Secondary Alexandrian readings. This confirms the results obtained in the quantitative analysis. Overall, he supports a higher percentage of Secondary Alexandrian readings (76.5%) than he does Primary Alexandrian readings (72.4%), and his support of both Alexandrian sub-groups is greater than his support of any other group (Caesarean = 68.9%; Byzantine = 66.1%; Western = 42.3%).

Table 18 provides Athanasius support of uniform and predominant readings that are also distinctive, exclusive, or primary when the Alexandrian witnesses are split into two sub-groups. This table provides the most substantial evidence that Athanasius belongs to the Secondary Alexandrian subgroup, especially for the Gospel of John. In John, his support of Secondary Alexandrian

---

[44]Notice that the number of non-Alexandrian uniform and predominant readings does not change (cf. Table 12).

Table 17

Athanasius Attestation of Intra-Group
Uniform and Predominant Readings
(Alexandrian Witnesses Split between Primary and Secondary)

	Uniform	Predominant	Totals
Matthew			
Prim. Alex.	36/47 (76.6%)	0/0 (-----)	36/47 (76.6%)
Sec. Alex.	28/36 (77.8%)	6/15 (40.0%)	34/51 (66.7%)
Byzantine	28/43 (65.1%)	4/8 (50.0%)	32/51 (62.7%)
Caesarean	26/32 (81.3%)	11/24 (45.8%)	37/56 (66.1%)
Western	7/19 (36.8%)	2/15 (13.3%)	9/34 (26.5%)
Mark			
Prim. Alex.	1/1 (100.0%)	0/0 (-----)	1/1 (100.0%)
Sec. Alex.	0/0 (-----)	1/1 (100.0%)	1/1 (100.0%)
Byzantine	0/1 (0.0%)	0/0 (-----)	0/1 (0.0%)
Caesarean	0/0 (-----)	1/1 (100.0%)	1/1 (100.0%)
Western	1/1 (100.0%)	0/0 (-----)	1/1 (100.0%)
Luke			
Prim. Alex.	18/23 (78.3%)	2/4 (50.0%)	20/27 (74.1%)
Sec. Alex.	13/13 (100.0%)	5/9 (55.6%)	18/22 (81.8%)
Byzantine	13/19 (66.7%)	5/9 (55.6%)	18/28 (64.3%)
Caesarean	14/21 (66.7%)	3/7 (42.9%)	17/28 (60.7%)
Western	5/10 (50.0%)	3/5 (60.0%)	8/15 (53.3%)
John			
Prim. Alex.	44/60 (73.3%)	17/28 (60.7%)	61/88 (69.3%)
Sec. Alex.	45/51 (88.2%)	19/28 (67.9%)	64/79 (79.7%)
Byzantine	52/65 (80.0%)	13/29 (44.8%)	65/94 (69.1%)
Caesarean	46/55 (83.6%)	23/40 (57.5%)	69/95 (72.6%)
Western	13/29 (44.8%)	13/25 (52.0%)	26/54 (48.1%)
Totals			
Prim. Alex.	99/131 (75.6%)	19/32 (59.4%)	118/163 (72.4%)
Sec. Alex.	86/100 (86.0%)	31/53 (58.5%)	117/153 (76.5%)
Byzantine	93/128 (72.7%)	22/46 (47.8%)	115/174 (66.1%)
Caesarean	86/108 (79.6%)	38/72 (52.8%)	124/180 (68.9%)
Western	26/59 (44.1%)	18/45 (40.0%)	44/104 (42.3%)

uniform/predominant d/e/p readings (75.0%) is more than double his support of such readings from any other group. His support of Primary Alexandrian uniform/predominant d/e/p readings (30.0%) is almost the same as his support of Byzantine (33.3%) and Caesarean (28.6%) readings. Overall, Athanasius supports a significantly higher percentage of Secondary Alexandrian readings than he supports the same type of readings from any other group. The primary weakness of using the results from Table 18 is the low number of sample readings (only 21 Primary Alexandrian; 7 Secondary Alexandrian; 26 Byzantine; 23 Caesarean; compared to 51 Western). Even a few additional readings could dramatically alter the final statistics.

Summarizing the results of the comparison of the Primary and Secondary Alexandrian sub-groups, Athanasius is best classified as a Secondary Alexandrian witness. This is especially true in John, but also likely in Matthew and Luke as well.

Table 18

Athanasius Support of Uniform and Predominant Readings That Are Also Distinctive, Exclusive, or Primary (Alexandrian Witnesses Split between Primary and Secondary)

	Uniform		Predominant		Totals	
Primary Alexandrian						
Matthew	1/3	(33.3%)	0/0	(-----)	1/3	(33.3%)
Mark	0/0	(-----)	0/0	(-----)	0/0	(-----)
Luke	3/5	(60.0%)	1/3	(33.3%)	4/8	(50.0%)
John	2/4	(50.0%)	1/6	(16.7%)	3/10	(30.0%)
Totals	6/12	(50.0%)	2/9	(22.2%)	8/21	(38.1%)
Secondary Alexandrian						
Matthew	1/2	(50.0%)	1/1	(100.0%)	2/3	(66.7%)
Mark	0/0	(-----)	0/0	(-----)	0/0	(-----)
Luke	0/0	(-----)	0/0	(-----)	0/0	(-----)
John	2/2	(100.0%)	1/2	(50.0%)	3/4	(75.0%)
Totals	3/4	(75.0%)	2/3	(66.7%)	5/7	(71.4%)
Byzantine						
Matthew	1/9	(11.1%)	1/2	(50.0%)	2/11	(18.2%)
Mark	0/1	(0.0%)	0/0	(-----)	0/1	(0.0%)
Luke	0/1	(0.0%)	0/1	(0.0%)	0/2	(0.0%)
John	3/5	(60.0%)	1/7	(14.3%)	4/12	(33.3%)
Totals	4/16	(25.0%)	2/10	(20.0%)	6/26	(23.1%)
Caesarean						
Matthew	1/2	(50.0%)	3/10	(30.0%)	4/12	(33.3%)
Mark	0/0	(-----)	0/0	(-----)	0/0	(-----)
Luke	0/1	(0.0%)	1/3	(33.3%)	1/4	(25.0%)
John	0/0	(-----)	2/7	(28.6%)	2/7	(28.6%)
Totals	1/3	(33.3%)	6/20	(30.0%)	7/23	(30.4%)
Western						
Matthew	1/9	(11.1%)	1/12	(8.3%)	2/21	(9.5%)
Mark	0/0	(-----)	0/0	(-----)	0/0	(-----)
Luke	1/5	(20.0%)	0/1	(0.0%)	1/6	(16.7%)
John	1/12	(8.3%)	2/12	(16.7%)	3/24	(12.5%)
Totals	3/26	(11.5%)	3/25	(12.0%)	6/51	(11.8%)

CHAPTER 7

ATHANASIUS, THE CORRECTIONS OF SINAITICUS, AND THE NAMELESS SHAPERS OF THE TEXT

So what? What is the value of all these textual minutiae? The question of relevance is especially appropriate since the information gleaned from the collection, collation, and analysis of Athanasius' text of the Gospels produces few surprises. It is not surprising that Athanasius preserves an Alexandrian form of the NT text, especially since he was born and educated in Alexandria and served as deacon and bishop of the Alexandrian church.[1] Furthermore, it is not surprising that his text displays closer affinities to secondary Alexandrian witnesses than to primary Alexandrian witnesses. Didymus, his Alexandrian contemporary who headed the catechetical school in Alexandria, displays similar textual affinities.[2] In all, the textual analysis

---

[1]Although there is no necessary connection between the Alexandrian text-type and the city of Alexandria, studies of the text of such Alexandrian authors as Origen and Didymus prove that the Alexandrian text-type was present and used in Alexandria itself. See Chapter 2 for further details concerning the connection between the city and the text-type named after it.

[2]See Ehrman, Didymus, 256-258.

yields no results that shake the foundations of the text critical world.

In addition to the corroborative results of the textual analysis, this study also provides an additional fourth-century witness to the Alexandrian text of the Gospels, albeit a relatively "impure" one, that can be used for future comparisons and collations. But once again the question of relevance arises. Is the extent of the usefulness of this study limited to its reconstructed text of the Gospels and its textual apparatus? Outside of the handful of textual critics who might be interested in Athanasius' text and/or the analysis of that text, are there any broader implications for people in other disciplines? In this final chapter, I will show that a close examination of Athanasius' text does indeed provide helpful information to people outside of the field of textual criticism, especially in areas pertaining to early Christian exegesis of scripture, to general attitudes toward and treatment of the biblical text within the early post-Nicene church, and to the impact of such attitudes on the transmission of the NT text in Alexandria.

First, I will discuss a few of the changes that Athanasius makes when citing from the Gospels, pointing out their theological and rhetorical significance in his writings. I will then show that some of the textual variants found in Athanasius' citations actually entered

into the transmission of the Alexandrian text. This can be seen most clearly in some of the corrections made to Codex Sinaiticus (ℵ). Finally, I will offer a modest proposal as to how the NT citations of church fathers might have influenced the actual transmission of the text and the implications for writing the history of the Alexandrian text in particular.

Athanasius' "Corruptions" of the Text

On numerous occasions, Athanasius' references to the Gospels reveal that he is using forms of the text that are not found among witnesses of the major textual traditions. In some cases, Athanasius' wording stands alone against all others. At other times, his wording is supported by one or a few isolated Greek manuscripts or another church author. Athanasius' unique readings deserve closer examination. The question arises concerning how these unique readings can be identified and described.

In NT textual criticism, great efforts have been made to re-establish the "original text" of the NT as closely as possible.[3] Once the original text has been established,

---

[3]The notion of an "original text" is highly enigmatic. Many people assume that a biblical book in its entirety came from the hand of the author in a form very close to that which is found in later manuscripts. Text critics attempt to reconstruct the "original" text using later witnesses, although they often disagree concerning which method(s) are the best to reconstruct the original. This

then any deviations from this norm are considered to be "corruptions" of the text. Textual critics use the term "corruption" in two different ways - some see "corruption" as a value-neutral term and use it to describe any change in the text, no matter how that change arose; others view "corruption" as a negative term and use it to describe only those changes in the text made deliberately by someone who desired to alter the meaning of the text for a particular reason, oftentimes theological.[4]

Athanasius' references to the Gospels contain several "corruptions" which I will argue fit both connotations of the word.[5] Any reference categorized as an "adaptation"

==========

reconstruction of the "original" is considered to be the "pristine" form of the text. Unfortunately, this process is too simplistic because it overlooks the complicated composition history of the texts. A text might undergo several editions, redactions, and interpolations by the original author, as well as by later redactors/editors, before it appears in a form close to that found in later textual witnesses. It is very difficult to establish the precise stage in the composition history at which a text should be labeled "the original" text, or in other words, when one moves from composition to transmission.

[4]This second use of the term is quite problematic. It depends upon the establishment of "intent" - an impossible endeavor even when a scholar knows the precise author and audience of a particular writing, let alone the intent of a nameless, dateless, placeless scribe from centuries ago who made alterations in a text.

[5]Not heeding my own warning made in the previous note (the proverbial dog returning to its own vomit!), I fall into the abyss of establishing Athanasius' intentions when citing from the Gospels. While individual instances of my analysis may be successfully challenged, I hope that the breadth of examples will show that Athanasius is deliberately "playing around" with his biblical texts. But

(represented by the symbol [Ad] in the apparatus)[6] is by definition a "corruption" since the "original" wording has been changed in some way. Yet not all corruptions are created equal - several different types exist. The first type of corruptions comprises changes due to Athanasius' careless citation techniques. These include changes resulting from faulty memory or mixture of two or more texts. A second type includes deliberate changes, yet which do not display any apparent intent to alter the meaning of the text. For example, Athanasius may make a grammatical change in a biblical passage in order to fit it into the context of his writing, but the meaning of the biblical text remains unaltered. A third type consists of deliberate changes to the text with the apparent intention of altering the meaning of the text for theological and/or polemical reasons. This final category of alterations results in some of the most interesting examples of patristic exegesis of biblical texts in the fourth century and, ultimately, the effects which these alterations had on the transmission of the text.

==========

even if all my examples are proven to be false, and we conclude that Athanasius is completely oblivious to any of the changes he makes in his biblical text, my final point will not be affected - namely that Athanasius *did* make changes to his text, and these changes *did* have an impact on the transmission of the text.

[6]For a definition of the term "adaptation," see Chapter 3.

In the following sections, I will describe a few of the corruptions found in Athanasius' text in which the meaning of the biblical text is altered in some way.[7] As previously mentioned, some of his changes appear to be intentional, but for others intent is more difficult to establish. In either case, the corruption of the text results in a change in meaning of the text, creating, in effect, a "new" biblical text that has the same authority (rhetorically speaking) as the "original" text.

Omissions

Athanasius occasionally "corrupted" his text of the Gospels by omitting portions from his citations. An excellent example can be seen in his famous *39th Easter Letter* 6, where he makes a reference to Jn 5:39. Leading up to this citation, Athanasius has listed all the books he believed should be included in the Old and New Testament canons. Describing these books, he goes on to say:

> These are the fountains of salvation, so that those who thirst may be satisfied with these words. In these alone are proclaimed the doctrine of godliness. Let no one add to these, nor take anything from these. For concerning these the Lord put to shame the Sadducees saying, "You are wrong, because you know neither the scriptures nor their power" (Mt 22:29 = Mk 12:24), and he advised the Jews, "Search the scriptures, because they are the ones that testify concerning me" (Jn 5:39)

---

[7]The examples of "corruptions" in Athanasius' text that I discuss below are not exhaustive. I have listed some of the more significant changes that illustrate the effects of these alterations.

Athanasius introduces his citation of Jn 5:39 as being the very words of Jesus, yet a significant omission occurs. The following represents the "original" reading of Jn 5:39, as represented in NA[27], followed by Athanasius' "corruption:"

NA[27]:

ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν· καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ.

You search the scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that testify on my behalf. (NRSV)

Ath:

ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι αὐταί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ. (*Epistula Festales XXXIX* 6)

Search the scriptures, for these are they that testify of me.

Athanasius' citation omits the section of this verse which states "you think that in them you have eternal life" (ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν). This omission changes the force of the verb ἐραυνᾶτε from an indicative "you search the scriptures" to an imperative "*search* the scriptures."

More importantly, Athanasius has omitted the portion of the passage that could be interpreted as a negative remark concerning scripture. In the Gospel of John, the force of Jesus' statement is that "the Jews" search the scripture because they think that eternal life can be found in the scripture itself, whereas Jesus states that the

scriptures bear witness to him (cf. Jn 5:46), in whom can be found eternal life (5:40). But for Athanasius, the entire point of his passage is that the scriptures *are* the "fountains of salvation" in which eternal life can be found. Thus, the portion of the text of Jn 5:39 which calls into question the scripture's ability to provide eternal life (i.e. "you think that in them you have eternal life") speaks against the very point that Athanasius is trying to make. By omitting this portion of the text, Athanasius creates a scriptural citation that supports his position.[8]

A similar instance of "creative omission" can be seen in Athanasius' use of Mt 11:27. The following presents the "original" reading of Mt 11:27 (as found in NA^{27}) followed by Athanasius' five references to this verse:

==========

[8]Interestingly, the other textual witness that supports the omission of this clause is Didymus. In his commentary on Zechariah (Ze 384:13), Didymus uses the same wording as Athanasius' adaptation. There are at least two possible explanations for this agreement in wording: (1) This wording represents a form of the text of Jn 5:39 that already existed in the Alexandrian textual tradition, and Athanasius and Didymus both accurately cite their biblical source(s). The lack of any Greek or versional manuscripts supporting this variant greatly reduces the likelihood of this possibility; (2) This wording represents a common paraphrase of the verse that existed in Alexandria which both Athanasius and Didymus used, but which never entered into the "stream of transmission" of the text. But how and why would such a common paraphrase develop? A plausible explanation would be the polemical context of the fourth century. This particular adaptation of the verse might have been attractive to different church authors who found themselves in similar theological battles.

NA[27]:

οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱον εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώκσει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι

No one knows the Son except the Father; and no one knows the Father except the Son, and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him. (NRSV)

Ath:

οὐδεὶς οἶδε τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ (*De Dec.* 12)

No one knows the Son except the Father; and no one knows the Father except the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him.

οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ (*Oratio i contra Arianos* 12)

οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ (*Oratio i contra Arianos* 39)

No one knows the Father except the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him.

οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός (*Oratio ii contra Arianos* 22)

οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός (*Oratio ii contra Arianos* 22)

No one knows the Father except Son.

In the first example from *De Decretis* 12, Athanasius cites the whole verse, thereby demonstrating his knowledge of the "original" form of the verse in its entirety.[9] In his

---

[9]Even this citation of the "entire" text of Mt 11:27 has a notable omission. In *De Decretis* 12 as well as the two references in *Oratio i contra Arianos* 12 and 39, Athanasius omits the word βουλεται. Although this omission could be the result of carelessness, the fact that it occurs in three different places makes it more likely that it was an intentional omission. Perhaps Athanasius thought it inconceivable that the Son would not "wish/desire" to

other four references, all found in the *Orationes contra Arianos*, he gives an abbreviated form of the verse. All four of these references occur with introductory formulas that indicate that they represent the very words of Jesus. In these references, he uses the first two words of the verse, "no one knows" (ουδεις [επι]γινωσκει), then omits the middle portion of the verse "the Son except the Father" (τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ), and then jumps to the final portion of the verse, "the Father except the Son" (τον πατερα εἰ μη ὁ υἱος). The question is, why would Athanasius omit the middle section of the verse?

In each of the three contexts in the *Orationes contra Arianos* in which Athanasius refers to Mt 11:27, he speaks about the necessity of contemplating the Son in order to know the Father. For example, in *Oratio i contra Arianos* 12 he prefaces his reference to Mt 11:27 with the statement:

> If through the Son it [the creation] has come to be, and "in him all things consist" (Col 1:17), it must follow that he who contemplates the creation rightly, is contemplating also the Word who framed it, and through Him begins to apprehend the Father. And if, as the Saviour also says, "No one knows the Father, save the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal Him" (Mt 11:27)

According to Athanasius, since every person can contemplate or know the Son, then everyone can also know the Father.

==========

reveal the Father.

In fact, humans can know the Father *only* through the Son. It would defeat the point of his argument to include the portion of the verse that states that "no one knows the Son except the Father," since this indicates that the Son is in some way hidden from human comprehension. Thus, by omitting this portion of the text, Athanasius is able to create a scripture that supports his theological point.[10]

==========

[10]The other two contexts in the *Orationes* that cite Mt 11:27 also deal with the necessity of knowing the Father through the Son. In *Oratio i contra Arianos* 39, Athanasius states:

> Therefore He was not a man and then became God, but He was God and then became man, and that to deify us... For how in that case can any at all know God as their Father? For there could not be adoption apart from the real Son, who says, "No one knows the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him (Mt 11:27) (NPNF, 329).

In *Oratio ii contra Arianos* 22, Athanasius is arguing against the Arian interpretation of Pr 8:22 that the Son is a creature. He asks the question:

> And whereas all things are from nothing and are creatures, and the Son, as they say, is one of the creatures too, and of things which once were not, how does He alone reveal the Father and none else but He know the Father? For could He, a work, possibly know the Father, then must the Father be also known by all according to the proportion of the measures of each: for all of them are works as He is. But if it be impossible for things originate either to see or to know (since God Himself says, "No one shall see My face and live" (Ex 33:20)), yet the Son has declared "no one knows the Father save the Son" (Mt 11:27), therefore the Word is different from all things originate, in that He alone knows and alone sees the Father, as He says, "Not that any one has seen the Father, save He that is from the Father" (Jn 6:46) and "no one knows the Father except the Son" (Mt 11:27), though Arius think otherwise... (NPNF, 360).

Thus in each context, Athanasius uses Mt 11:27 to argue that people know the Father only through the Son, and that the Son is knowable to all people because he became human.

In the one place where Athanasius cites the entire verse (*De Dec.* 12), his interest lies in issues other than the means of knowing the Father, therefore, there is no need for omitting the middle portion of the verse.[11]

One final example, while it might not technically be described as an omission, shows that Athanasius neglects the citation of an entire sentence that could have been problematic to him. Athanasius frequently cites all or portions of Jn 1:1 and Jn 1:3 (over 20 times each), yet he only cites Jn 1:2 on *one* occasion (*De Decretis* 17.7) at which time he includes it in a longer citation from Jn 1:1-3. He never cites Jn 1:2 by itself, but he frequently cites Jn 1:1 and 1:3 in isolation. His dislike of citing Jn 1:2 is highlighted when one observes that in *Contra Gentes* 42, he cites 1:1 immediately followed by 1:3, omitting 1:2 entirely!

What aspect of this verse did Athanasius find dangerous or unpalatable? At first consideration, the verse's temporal implications, "this one was *in the beginning* with God," might have made Athanasius hesitant to cite it. The Arians argued that the Son was a created

---

[11]In the context of *De Decretis* 12, Athanasius is speaking about the mystery of the generation of the Son and how it exceeds and transcends the thoughts of humans. Thus, "Only the Father knows the Son" is used in the context of understanding the generation of the Son from the Father. In this context, Athanasius uses Mt 11:27 as proof of the unity of essence and existence of the the Father and Son.

being and that he had a time of origin. One of the Arians' important doctrinal statements was, "There was a time when he was not."[12] The Arians equated εν αρχη ("in the beginning") with the time when God created the Word. Thus, one *might* suppose that Athanasius did not like to cite Jn 1:2 because it tied the Word to the beginning of time. But this in fact does *not* seem to be the case.

On numerous occasions (13 times), Athanasius cites the beginning portion of Jn 1:1 by itself - εν αρχη ην ο λογος ("in the beginning was the word"). In these cases, he does not object to the connection between the Word and εν αρχη. Therefore, it does not appear that he refrained from citing Jn 1:2 for this reason.

One aspect of his citation of Jn 1:1 may help to explain his neglect of 1:2. He cites the final portion of Jn 1:1 in isolation five times (και θεος ην ο λογος - "and the word was God"), but he never cites the middle portion of the verse by itself (και ο λογος ην προς τον θεον - "and the word was with God"). He cites the middle portion of the verse only in conjunction with the beginning or ending of the verse. This suggests that Athanasius disliked citing ην προς τον θεον, whether it be from Jn 1:1 or Jn

---

[12]This depiction of the Arian view is based on Athanasius' description of the Arians. Athanasius frequently attacked the Arians on account of this statement. Whether or not the temporal origin of the Word was central to Arian doctrine is still debated.

1:2. This aversion is clearly seen in an adaptation of Jn 1:1 found in *Oratio ii contra Arianos* 56, which appears as follows:

> "In the beginning was the Word," for although no works had been created still, "the Word of God was, and the Word was God"

In this instance, Athanasius cites the first portion of Jn 1:1 verbatim (εν αρχη ην ο λογος); he makes a short remark ("for although no works had been created still..."); he then adapts the middle portion of the verse from ο λογος ην προς τον θεον ("the word was with God") to ην ο λογος του θεου ("the word of God was"); and finally he cites the ending of the verse verbatim (και θεος ην ο λογος). By adapting the middle portion of Jn 1:1, Athanasius shows that "the Word of God" *was* (i.e. existed) before creation and that the Word was God. From this, he draws the conclusion that "the Son then is not a creature." This adaptation of the middle portion of Jn 1:1, and the few number of references to the middle of Jn 1:1 or Jn 1:2 in general, are evidence of Athanasius' reluctance to use the statement ο λογος ην προς τον θεον ("the Word was with God").

The theological motivations behind Athanasius' reluctance to cite ο λογος ην προς θεον are not readily apparent. Perhaps this statement could be interpreted as saying that the Word existed "along with" God (in other

words, as a distinct being). Interpreted in this way, the verse could be used in opposition to the Nicene doctrine of *homoousios*, that the Word shared the same essence as God.

These examples show that Athanasius omitted portions of biblical texts which could be interpreted in ways that opposed his own theological views. In doing so, he created new "biblical" texts that served his rhetorical purposes.

Grammatical Changes

Having established that Athanasius changed the meaning of biblical texts by omitting portions in his references, I now turn to a second type of "corruption" by which he fits biblical passages into his polemical agenda - grammatical changes. The first example comes from a reference to Mt 7:6 in *Apologia contra Arianos*.

NA^{27}:

μη δωτε το αγιον τοις κυσιν μηδε βαλητε τους μαργαριτας υμων εμπροσθεν των χοιρων

Do not give what is holy to dogs; and do not throw your pearls before swine

Ath:

μη δωτε τα αγια τοις κυσι μηδε βαλητε τους μαργαριτας εμπροσθεν των χοιρων

Do not give holy things to dogs; and do not throw pearls before swine

In citing this verse, Athanasius makes two adaptations. He changes the singular το αγιον to the plural τα αγια, and he

omits υμων after μαργαριτας.[13] The literary context in Matthew does not provide any interpretive clues as to what το αγιον represents.

Athanasius uses this citation while arguing against charges that his assistant, Macarius, had broken a communion cup that belonged to the Meletians. Athanasius agrees that if a person intentionally breaks "the cup belonging to the mysteries," then that person is "impious." But Athanasius vehemently denies that the cup which was broken was a "cup belonging to the mysteries" for three reasons: (1) the place the cup was broken was not a church; (2) there was no Presbyter present to administer the sacrament; and (3) the day on which it was broken was not the Lord's day (*Apologia contra Arianos* 11).

Before making this defense, however, Athanasius attacks the character of the Meletians. It is in this context that Athanasius refers to Mt 7:6. He claims that the Meletians "are not ashamed to parade the sacred mysteries (τα μυστηρια) before catechumens and, worse than that, even before heathens." He then adapts Mt 7:6 in order to indict the Meletians for this activity. He introduces the citation with "as the Lord has charged

---

[13]Once again, Athanasius' wording is supported by other Alexandrian fathers. Didymus supports the plural τα αγια in three out of five places where he makes a reference to this portion of Mt 7:6. Both Clement and Didymus (in four out of five instances) omit the pronoun υμων.

us..." again presenting his adapted form as the very words of Jesus. By changing the singular αγιον to the plural τα αγια, Athanasius equates the plural τα αγια ("holy things") with the plural τα μυστηρια ("the mysteries"). The effect of this change is that Jesus himself convicts the Meletians of giving holy things (i.e. the mysteries) to "dogs" (i.e. the heathen). The grammatical change has allowed Athanasius to use this verse for polemical purposes.

A second example of a grammatical change that fits a biblical text into Athanasius' polemical agenda can be seen in his allusion to Mt 12:30 (= Lk 11:23) in *Oratio i contra Arianos* 1.

NA[27]:
καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει
Whoever does not gather with me scatters

Ath:
μὴ συνάγοντες μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν σκορπίζουσι μετὰ τοῦ διαβόλου (*Oratio i contra Arianos* 1)
Those who do not gather with us, scatter with the devil

Athanasius introduces his reference to Mt 12:30 with the words "Therefore, as the savior says..." (διὸ καὶ, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ σωτὴρ). The reader expects him to provide the very words of Jesus, but instead Athanasius makes three major alterations to the text. First, he changes the singular participle συνάγων to the plural συνάγοντες (the corresponding singular verb σκορπιζει is also changed to the plural σκορπιζουσι). Second, he changes the first

person pronoun ἐμοῦ to the first person plural ἡμῶν. And finally, he adds the phrase "with the devil" (μετὰ τοῦ διαβόλου) to the end.

These grammatical alterations have several effects. In the Matthean context, Jesus is responding to the Pharisees' accusation that Jesus is casting out demons by the power of Beelzebul. Jesus responds by stating that a house divided against itself cannot stand and that in order to plunder the "strong man's" (most likely to be understood as Satan's) house, a person must first "bind" the strongman (a possible allusion to Jesus' casting out demons). Jesus then makes the comment, "Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters." He follows this with a comment about speaking against the Holy Spirit. Thus, Jesus' comment "whoever does not gather" seems to be directed towards individuals among the Pharisees.

In the *Oratio i contra Arianos*, Athanasius claims that the "authors" of "all other heresies" (those that preceded the Arian heresy) "went out" (in other words, apostatized) from the true church. To support his view that these heretics "*never* thought nor now think like us," he refers to Mt 12:30. The alterations create a scripture in which Jesus speaks against *all* people who oppose *the church*. Athanasius is able to include all heretics by making the participle plural (μη συναγοντες - "those who do not

gather") instead of individual Pharisees (μη συναγων - "he who does not gather") who oppose Jesus. Furthermore, by changing the pronoun from εμου ("with me" - meaning Jesus alone) to ημων (with us), Athanasius claims that all those who oppose the entire church (not just Jesus alone) are "scatterers." Not only are they "scatterers" (as stated in the Gospel), Athanasius also accuses them of being in league *with the devil* (by adding the final phrase). Athanasius' adaptations create a new scripture which broadens the original passage's applicability and strengthens its condemnation of Athanasius' contemporary opponents.

Word Substitutions

A third way in which Athanasius "corrupts" his biblical text is through the substitution of words. In the same passage from the *39th Paschal Letter* mentioned above (concerning Jn 5:39), Athanasius makes a reference to Mt 22:29 (= Mk 12:24). The "original" wording of Mt 22:39 (according to NA^{27}) and Athanasius' adapted form of the verse are as follows:

NA^{27}:

πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ

You are wrong, because you know neither the scriptures nor the power of God (NRSV)

Ath:

πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν
(*Epistula Festales XXXIX* 6)

You are wrong, because you know neither the scriptures nor their power

Athanasius has replaced του θεου ("of God") with the word αυτων ("their"), changing the text from "not knowing the scriptures nor the power *of God*" (μηδε την δυναμιν του θεου) to "not knowing the scriptures nor *their* power" (μηδε την δυναμιν αυτων). The rhetorical impact of this change is that whereas the text as found in the Gospels makes a distinction between the scripture and the power of God, in Athanasius' adaptation, the agent of "power" is the scripture itself. This adaptation further highlights the importance and uniqueness which Athanasius places on the scripture. Athanasius uses this "corrupted" text to support his argument concerning which books should be included in the canon, and that nothing should be added or taken away from these books.

Athanasius is likely to be the originator of this corruption. Since this variant is not found in any other textual witness either before or after Athanasius, it is unlikely that he took it from some other source. Furthermore, Athanasius confirms his knowledge of the "original" form of this verse (την δυναμιν του θεου) by

citing it "correctly" in *Oratio i contra Arianos* 52.[14] The substitution of words in his *39th Paschal Letter* is unique to Athanasius and to this particular polemical context. Ironically, his corruption of scripture is used to support his argument concerning scripture that, "Let no one add to these, nor let him take anything from these."

Athanasius as a Corruptor of Scripture

The preceding examples show that in certain circumstances, Athanasius was willing to corrupt his biblical texts in order to fit them into his polemical contexts. He corrupted his texts not only through omission, grammatical changes, and substitutions (as discussed above), but also through complex conflations,[15]

==========

[14]In the context of *Oratio i contra Arianos* 52, Athanasius is arguing that the nature of the Word is unalterable. He accuses the Arians of not discerning the scripture's meaning, stating that they "lay down their irreligion as a sort of canon of interpretation" and "twist the whole of the divine oracles into accordance with it." In response to such errors of doctrine, one can only say, "You are wrong, because you know neither the scriptures nor the power of God." In this context, Athanasius is not specifically speaking about the nature of scripture, so there is no need for him to alter the wording to speak of the power of scripture.

[15]An excellent example is found in *De Decretis* 35 in which he cites a highly conflated form of Lk 21:8 and Mt 24:4-5 (= Mk 13:5-6). Athanasius is speaking about the Arians who have been excommunicated from the church. He informs his readers that although these men had been at one time instructed in the doctrines of the church, they have now drifted away. Athanasius goes on to say that the church should not be greatly surprised at this since Hymneaeus and

minor additions to texts,[16] and wholesale invention of "biblical" texts.

A excellent example of a fabricated text is found in his *Oratio ii contra Arianos*. In chapters 11-18, Athanasius goes to great lengths to explain Acts 2:36, which states:

> Therefore, let the entire house of Israel know with certainty that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified.

The Arians were using this verse (along with several others) to support their view that the Word of God was a creature and a work and something that had a beginning or origin. Athanasius accuses the Arians of "mistaking the

==========

Philetus did the same to Paul, as well as Judas to Jesus. He introduces his biblical "citation" with the words "And concerning these same persons, we have not been left without instruction, but the Lord has forewarned..." Athanasius goes on to give this reference:

> βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήση. πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικε καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσι. μὴ πορευθῆτε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν

Although presented as the very words of Jesus, this reference is actually a complex combination of passages from the synoptic Gospels (see Chapter 4, Lk 21:8, n. 65). By combining these passages, Athanasius effectively "creates" a new scripture that contains *several* warnings against following false teachers (in this case, the Arians) in a single citation. This newly created scripture, while minimizing space through conflation, maintains a high level of authority since it effectively becomes scripture for Athanasius' readers.

[16]For an example of an addition, see Mt 12:30, the second example in the section "Grammatical Changes" discussed above.

sense" of these passages, stating that they "deceive the thoughtless, making the language of Scripture their pretense, but instead sowing upon it the poison of their own heresy." In order to provide what he thinks is the correct interpretation of Acts 2:36, Athanasius creates a speech and places it on the lips of Peter. In *Oratio ii contra Arianos* 16, Athanasius writes:

> Peter then, having learned this from the Savior, in both points sets the Jews right, saying, "O Jews, the divine scriptures announce that Christ will come, and you consider him a mere man as one of Davids descendants..."

The long speech that follows cannot be found in any extant writing. In this speech, Peter quotes from OT passages (Dt, Ps, and Is) and even once from Paul (1 Cor 1:21)! After closing Peter's speech, Athanasius concludes that, "Most of the Jews, then, came to their senses and immediately acknowledged the Christ, as is written in Acts," which alludes to the Jewish response in Acts 2:37-42. Thus we see that Athanasius has created an entire speech of Peter, placing it in the context of Acts 2:36, which explains the "sense" of Peter's statement that God "made" Jesus Lord and Christ. Athanasius does not qualify this long speech. He presents it as the very words of Peter, thus giving it scriptural authority. The advantages of creating such a biblical "citation" are immediately evident. Athanasius can place his own concerns and views

on the lips of Peter, and thus make it appear that Peter himself is fighting the Arian heresy.

These examples of textual corruption indicate that Athanasius was not always concerned with verbal accuracy when citing from the NT. He makes no distinction between instances in which he cites "word-for-word" and those in which he makes omissions, grammatical changes, substitutions, conflations, or outright inventions of biblical texts.[17] In fact, he seldom makes an argument from or for a particular wording.[18] This indicates that the

==========

[17]Even though Athanasius occasionally corrupted his biblical text, this was the exception rather than the rule. Most of the time he preserves his text quite closely. Furthermore, many of the corruptions do not affect his textual affinities because they were made independently of the textual tradition. In other words, the corruptions do not make him agree with one textual group against the others (although some of his corruptions do enter into the Alexandrian stream of transmission as will be argued below). Overall, Athanasius was "careful" enough in his citation habits that the Alexandrian text behind his quotations is still evident through textual analysis (as shown in Chapter 5 and 6).

[18]An exception to this rule can be seen in *Epistula ad Epictetum* 5, in which Athanasius makes reference to Lk 1:35. Athanasius is arguing against those who claim that the "flesh" that the Word became was not "natural." In this passage, Athanasius makes a point that "Gabriel preached the gospel to her [Mary] without uncertainty, saying not merely 'what is begotten *in* you' (το γεννωμενον εν σοι) lest the body should be thought to be extraneously induced upon her, but '*from* you' (εκ σου) that what was begotten might be believed to be naturally from her." Both of these variants (εν σοι and εκ σου) are supported in the manuscript tradition. Athanasius' text contained εκ σου, but whether he knew of other manuscripts or authors that used εν σοι is not certain.

actual wording of the Bible is not his primary concern. What is most important to Athanasius is the overall "sense" of the scripture. This emphasis on the "sense" allows him to attack the Arians for their use of "unscriptural phrases" (ἀγράφους λέξεσιν - *De Decretis* 18) on the one hand, and yet defend the Nicene party's use of the two unscriptural expressions ἐκ τοῦ οὐσιός ("from the essence") and ὁμοουσίος ("of the same essence") on the other. The church is permitted to use these phrases because they contain the "sense of the Scriptures" (ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν τὴν διάνοιαν). So, even though Athanasius acknowledges the existence of "scriptural" and "unscriptural" words and phrases, they are not as important to him as the so-called "sense" of the scriptures. It is not surprising then that Athanasius felt free to make changes in the wording of his biblical references in order to fit them into the context of his polemic.[19] The final rhetorical effect of these

---

[19]This "freedom" in citing texts is evident in the history of Alexandrian exegesis and textual transmission. In a recent discussion of Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian interpretation of "canonical" texts in Alexandria, David Dawson (Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992) has shown that Alexandrian interpreters, whether classical, Jewish, or Christian were not overly concerned with preserving the precise wording of their texts. The philologists of Alexandria who edited the "canonical" texts of Greek literature frequently emended texts on the basis of literary and/or thematic "fittingness" (ibid., 66-72). This was the scholarly background in which the Alexandrian authors were educated. Thus, we might expect to see them concerned with the

changes, whether intentional or not, is that Athanasius creates new scriptures which sound very much like himself.

Athanasius and the Corrections of Sinaiticus

Having shown that Athanasius made corruptions in the NT text, I will demonstrate that such corruptions of scripture eventually made their way into the stream of transmission. In Athanasius' case, the best evidence of this process taking place can be seen in his close affinity to the corrections of Codex Sinaiticus (ℵ).

Codex Sinaiticus was most likely transcribed during Athanasius' lifetime.[20] Over the centuries, several correctors put their pens to the codex. Yet, in the words of H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat, "the study and identification of the various correctors constitutes the most difficult task in the investigation of the manuscript."[21] Milne and Skeat simplify the "formidable

---

grammatical, thematic, or even polemical "fittingness" of their biblical texts more than a slavish devotion to the actual wording of the text.

[20]The consensus dating of ℵ is early-to-mid 4th century. See H. and K. Lake, Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus, N.T. (Oxford: 1911-12), ix-xv; H.J.M. Milne and T.C. Skeat, Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus (London: British Museum, 1938), 60-65; Metzger, Text, 42; B. and K. Aland, Text, 106.

[21]Milne and Skeat, Scribes and Correctors, 40. For additional discussion of the correctors as well as the identification of the actual correctors, see C. Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum cum epistola Barnabae et fragmentis Pastoris (Leipzig, 1863); E.H.

series" of correctors developed by Tischendorf and elaborated by K. Lake into two main groupings:[22] (1) the "earliest correctors," who were contemporaneous with the original scribe (this category included all of Tischendorf's and Lake's "A" and "B" correctors);[23] and (2) later correctors (comprised of all the "C" correctors), dating from the 5th-7th centuries.[24] As will be shown,

---

Hansell, Novum Testamentum Graece, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1864); F.H.A. Scrivener, A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus, 2d ed. (Cambridge, 1867); H. and K. Lake, Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus, 2 vols. (Oxford: 1911-12).

[22]Milne and Skeat, Scribes and Correctors, 40. For the elaboration of the correctors see the "Prolegomena" to Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum, xxiii-xxxvi, and the introduction to H. and K. Lake, Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus, xvii-xviii and xxi-xxiv.

[23]Milne and Skeat, Scribes and Correctors, 40-46. According to Milne and Skeat, the source of some of the "A" and "B" corrections in the New Testament is the exemplar itself, but "there are signs of further revision, of actual collation with another textual tradition," but "whether such variants were already recorded in the exemplar or transferred from other manuscripts cannot as a rule be ascertained" (ibid., 45).

[24]Different scholars date the "C" correctors anywhere from the 5th to the 7th centuries (see K. Lake, The Text of the New Testament (London: Rivington, 1928) 13-14; B. Metzger Text, 46; Kenyon, Textual Criticism, 65; E.H. Hansell Novum Testamentum Graece, vol. 3, xxii.). Concerning the dating of the correctors, Milne and Skeat make the following conclusion:

> The A and B corrections we have shown to be contemporary with the manuscript, since they are attributable to the scribes of the text themselves. The C correctors have been assigned by some to the fifth, by others to the seventh century, and lack of comparative material enforces caution upon whosoever would decide between the two dates (Scribes and Correctors, 65).

Athanasius shows an remarkable affinity to both the early and later corrections.

When comparing Athanasius' text with the corrections of Sinaiticus, two factors must be considered. First, since the text of the Gospels preserved by Athanasius is so fragmentary, the number of corrections to ℵ in these portions of text will be small. Second, a distinction must be made where the split between $\aleph^*$ and $\aleph^c$ involves a unit of significant variation from those places where singular readings of $\aleph^*$ are corrected. Only the significant variants need to be considered. Singular readings in ℵ are usually the result of scribal error, and corrected readings will often be supported by the majority of other witnesses.

In units of significant variation, Athanasius agrees with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ six out of six times in Matthew, two out of three times in Luke, and fifteen out of sixteen times in John for a total of twenty-three out of twenty-five times, an amazing 92%. The following table (Table 19) presents the percentages of agreement between all the textual witnesses and $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ over these same 25 units of significant variation. Athanasius appears at the top of the list (behind only 1071 which has only 3 shared units of variation with $\aleph^c$), thus showing his close textual affinity to the corrections.[25]

---

[25]Athanasius agrees with $\aleph^*$ *against* $\aleph^c$ only in Lk 17:2.

Table 19

Witnesses Ranked According to Their Proportional Agreement with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ in Units of Significant Variation

1. 1071	3/3	100.0%
2. Ath	23/25	92.0%
3. A	17/19	89.5%
4. Orig	8/9	88.9%
5. Ψ	16/19	84.2%
6. f^{13} 1241	21/25	84.0%
8. 33	19/23	82.6%
9. Δ Π 700	20/25	80.0%
12. 565	19/24	79.2%
13. Ω	18/23	78.3%
14. E L Θ f^1 TR	19/25	76.0%
19. 892	13/18	72.2%
20. UBS^4	18/25	72.0%
21. P^{75}	5/7	71.4%
22. 579	12/17	70.6%
23. a b	15/22	68.2%
24. Clem	4/6	66.7%
25. B	16/25	64.0%
26. C	7/11	63.6%
27. W	12/20	60.0%
28. e	11/20	55.0%
29. P^{66}	7/13	53.8%
30. Did	2/4	50.0%
31. D	6/17	35.3%
32. k	1/3	33.3%

In order to see if the text of other Alexandrian authors displayed a similar textual affinity to the corrections of $\aleph$, I examined the text of the Fourth Gospel

---

In Jn 1:18, Athanasius disagrees with both $\aleph^*$ and $\aleph^c$. If corrections of singular readings and differences in the spellings of proper names are included (7/7 in Mt; 1/1 in Lk; 9/9 in Jn), and if Jn 1:18 is excluded (since Athanasius does not agree with either $\aleph^*$ or $\aleph^c$ against the other), then he agrees with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ an amazing forty out of forty-one times (97.6%) in the Gospels.

preserved by Origen and the text of all four Gospels preserved by Didymus. In Origen's text of John, ℵ is corrected in 123 units of significant variation.[26] Origen agrees with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ ninety-one out of 123 times (74%).[27] His level of agreement with $\aleph^c$ in John is still 18% less than Athanasius' agreement throughout the Gospels. In Didymus' text of the Gospels, ℵ is corrected in thirty-nine units of significant variation.[28] Didymus agrees with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ twenty-five out of thirty-nine times (64.1%).[29] This level of agreement is 28% less than

==========

[26]I used Origen's text of the Fourth Gospel as it is reconstructed by Ehrman, Fee, and Holmes in The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen, 38-344.

[27]The following table ranks the witnesses according to their percentage of agreement with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ in units of significant variation in Origen's text of the Fourth Gospel:

1. 33	(86.1%)	11. Ω	(70.2%)	21. B_1	(66.1%)
2. L	(82.8%)	12. E	(70.1%)	22. f^1	(65.1%)
3. 892	(82.6%)	13. Π	(70.1%)	23. P^{66}	(56.5%)
4. Ψ	(80.3%)	14. 700	(70.1%)	24. W	(51.9%)
5. 1241	(75.2%)	15. f^{13}	(69.3%)	25. b	(45.7%)
6. C	(75.0%)	16. UBS^4	(69.3%)	26. a	(40.9%)
7. Orig	(74.0%)	17. Δ	(69.0%)	27. D	(40.0%)
8. TR	(71.1%)	18. 579	(68.8%)	28. e	(35.4%)
9. P^{75}	(71.3%)	19. A	(67.6%)		
10. 565	(70.3%)	20. Θ	(66.9%)		

All the witnesses that agree with $\aleph^c$ more than Origen are secondary Alexandrian (with the possible exception of 1241).

[28]I used Didymus' text of the four Gospels as it is reconstructed and collated by Ehrman in Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels.

[29]The following table ranks the witnesses according to their percentage of agreement with $\aleph^c$ against $\aleph^*$ in units of significant variation found in Didymus' text of the

Athanasius'. Athanasius demonstrates a uniquely high level of affinity to the corrections of Sinaiticus, at least among Alexandrian authors.

What causes the affinity between Athanasius' text and the corrections of ℵ? The most likely answer is that Athanasius was familiar with a text very similar to the text(s) used to correct ℵ.[30] My initial observations indicate that ℵ^{c} is most closely aligned to secondary Alexandrian witnesses.[31] This observation leads to the

---

Gospels:

1. Ψ	(88.0%)	11. TR	(65.9%)	21. UBS^{4}	(56.8%)
2. Δ	(77.3%)	12. 1241	(64.3%)	22. f^{1}	(65.1%)
3. L	(76.2%)	13. Did	(64.1%)	23. W	(56.8%)
4. 579	(76.0%)	14. C$_{75}$	(64.0%)	24. e	(56.0%)
5. 33	(72.7%)	15. P^{75}	(63.2%)	25. a	(54.3%)
6. Ω	(70.7%)	16. A	(62.5%)	26. b	(52.8%)
7. 892	(70.3%)	17. E$_{1}$	(60.0%)	27. B	(52.3%)
8. Θ	(69.8%)	18. f^{1}	(59.1%)	28. k	(42.9%)
9. Π$_{13}$	(68.2%)	19. P^{66}	(57.9%)	29. D	(29.7%)
10. f^{13}	(65.9%)	20. W	(56.8%)		

Five of the top seven witnesses in agreement with ℵ^{c} against ℵ* are secondary Alexandrian (Ψ L 579 33 892), similar to the results in Origen. Didymus appears in the middle of the list, showing that he is not related to ℵ^{c} as closely as other secondary Alexandrian witnesses.

[30]The precise textual relationship between Athanasius and ℵ^{c} still needs to be examined. The number of shared texts between Athanasius and ℵ^{c} in the Gospels is much too small to make such grand conclusions. Further studies concerning Athanasius' text of the rest of the NT as well as the textual character of the corrections of ℵ need to be made.

[31]Table 19 shows that three (possibly five if Orig and 1241 are considered to be Secondary Alexandrian) of the top eight witnesses in agreement with ℵ^{c} against ℵ* are Secondary Alexandrian. The tables for Origen and Didymus demonstrate the high level of agreement between Secondary Alexandrian witnesses and ℵ^{c}.

possibility that the corrections of ℵ change it (at least partially) from being a Primary Alexandrian witness to a Secondary Alexandrian witness.[32]

The date of the corrections must also be considered when comparing Athanasius' text to ℵ^{c}. Six of the twenty-five corrections of ℵ (in units of significant variation) are attributed to correctors "A" or "B."[33] Following Milne's and Skeat's dating (given above), these correctors are contemporaneous with the original scribe of ℵ, and thus with Athanasius as well. Since in most cases corrections of a manuscript are made by comparisons to either the exemplar itself or to some other manuscript, then it is likely that the readings shared by Athanasius and correctors "A" or "B" of ℵ already exist within the textual tradition in the fourth century.

The remaining nineteen corrections of ℵ are attributed to corrector "C^{a}".[34] As stated above, this scribe corrected ℵ sometime in the 5th-7th century. This means that the readings attested by Athanasius (if they are not already in

---

[32]A more complete analysis of ℵ^{c} must be performed before it can be classified as a Secondary Alexandrian witness with any degree of certainty.

[33]The only correction attributed to corrector "A" is Mt 6:28. Corrector "B" is credited with corrections in Mt 6:25, 6:26, 13:25, 18:20 and Jn 1:18.

[34]Corrector "C^{a}" is identified as making corrections in Lk 1:27, 17:2, 24:39 and Jn 1:3, 1:13, 1:18, 6:38, 6:39, 6:46, 8:59, 12:32, 14:16, 14:28, 16:15, 17:5, 17:22, 18:37, 19:39 (2X).

the stream of transmission by the 4th century) entered that stream sometime between Athanasius' lifetime and the work of corrector "C^a". In a few cases, Athanasius is the *earliest* witness of variant readings which later appear in $\aleph^c$,[35] increasing the probability that certain readings attested by Athanasius did not exist in the textual tradition in the fourth century.[36] These readings

---

[35]To check for occurrences of variant readings attested by Athanasius in earlier patristic writings, I consulted the critical apparatus of C. Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, 8th ed., (Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869); H. Von Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1913); and S. Legg, Novum Testamentum Graece, (Oxonii: Clarendoniano, 1940). Of the twenty-three significant variants shared by Athanasius and $\aleph^c$, Athanasius is the earliest witness in at least two places. In Mt 24:17, Athanasius and $\aleph^c$ (corrector "B") are the *only* two witnesses that contain the reading καταβητω. In Jn 8:59, Athanasius is the oldest witness (alongside the Coptic Bohairic) that provides the longer ending ιερου και διελθων δια μεσου αυτων εποριευετο και παρηγεν ουτως. This reading is a distinctively secondary Alexandrian reading. Von Soden states it is found in Tatian's Diatessaron, but Tatian is not listed among the witnesses in UBS^4. Athanasius might also be the earliest witness of a reading in Mt 6:26. He includes the article τας before αποθηκας. This reading is supported by $\aleph^c$ (corrector "B" - 4th century) and L (8th century). Von Soden states it is found in Tatian's Diatessaron, but this witness is not listed in Legg.

[36]Certain variant readings were not in the textual tradition before the 4th century because Athanasius himself created them! The previous discussion of his "corruptions" clearly indicates that he created variant readings. This opens up the possibility that he might have been responsible for creating some of the readings that eventually appear in $\aleph^c$, although there is no way to prove this for any particular reading. While this may sound like a huge assumption, variant readings had to be created by somebody, so why not Athanasius?

eventually entered into the stream of transmission either before or at one of the times ℵ was corrected in the 5th-7th centuries.

Athanasius and the Nameless Shapers of the Text

The discussions above have argued that in certain instances, Athanasius corrupted his biblical text in order to fit it into his polemical contexts. Furthermore, readings attested by Athanasius eventually entered into the stream of textual transmission, as can be seen in some of the corrections of ℵ. The questions that remain are how and why did textual corruptions (such as Athanasius made) become part of the actual text? In order to answer this question, I now turn to a brief discussion of interpretive communities and scribal practices in the early church.

In a recent study, Bart Ehrman examines instances of christologically significant textual variants within the Greek manuscript tradition.[37] Ehrman observes an analogous relationship between the interpretation of texts, in which interpreters "rewrite" texts in their minds as they read and ascribe meaning to them, and the scribal activity of

---

[37]Bart D. Ehrman, The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

copying texts, in which scribes actually *do* rewrite them.[38] Based on his text-critical analysis of textual variants, Ehrman concludes that:

> Proto-orthodox scribes of the second and third centuries occasionally modified their texts of Scripture in order to make them coincide more closely with the christological views embraced by the party that would seal its victory at Nicea and Chalcedon.[39]

Ehrman states that the vast majority of textual alterations in the manuscript tradition can be labeled as "accidental" - in other words, the result of scribal ineptitude, carelessness, or fatigue.[40] Some alterations, however, are not accidental, but result from "intentional" changes made by the scribe.[41] These intentional changes can be classified according to their function: to improve grammar, to eliminate discrepancies, or to effect harmonizations. Some changes go beyond these corrective measures in order to change the *meaning* of the text. According to Ehrman, these types of corruptions

---

[38]Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 29-31.

[39]Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 275.

[40]Ehrman, Orthodox Corruptions, 27 and 275.

[41]Ehrman acknowledges the theoretical difficulty of establishing the "intentions" or "personal motivations" of an individual scribe (Orthodox Corruption, 27-28). We do not have access to scribes' intentions, only their texts. Thus Ehrman chooses "to speak metaphorically of the intentions of scribal *changes* rather than the intentions of *scribes*..." (ibid., 28; see also p. 275).

> ...change the text's meaning, or to put a different slant on it, "improve" its theology. It is not only thinkable that scribes *would* make such changes, it is manifest that they did. Scribes altered their sacred texts to make them "say" what they were already known to "mean."[42]

The question remains as to how these unknown scribes - these nameless, faceless shapers of the text - developed their theology which affected their understanding and, ultimately, their transcription of particular texts. Put simply, how did a scribe know what a text "meant?"

Scribes belonged to larger communities of Christians. These communities were defined by their location, their worship practices, their relationship to other communities, and most importantly, their theology. Communities were identified according to different sizes and relationships to larger groupings or sub-groupings. For example, one can speak of "Arianism" as a whole, but there were probably many sub-groups that shared certain "Arian" doctrines but differed in other areas. One could just as correctly speak of "Arianisms," as well as differing "Nicene" communities (groups that adopted the Nicene creed about the nature of the Son, but differed in other significant areas).

People within these religious communities shared a common set of beliefs. Usually the community allowed for a certain range of viewpoints concerning particular points of

---

[42]Ehrman, Orthodox Corruptions, 275-76.

theology. The "flexibility" of each community concerning particular doctrines varied from community to community and doctrine to doctrine. The "range" of some areas of doctrine might be very narrowly construed, while other areas much more liberally constructed. If a person's (or sub-group's) theology strayed beyond the "limits" accepted by the community, the person was no longer included within the community. In order to maintain community "boundaries" by which a community could identify itself, these communities developed canons and ways of interpreting and understanding their sacred scriptures. Ehrman speaks of "communities of like-minded readers."[43] People who belong to these communities are...

> ...bound to an intricate network of social, cultural, historical, and intellectual contexts, contexts that affect both who a person is and how he or she will "see" the world at large, including the texts within it... this nexus of factors does more than *influence* the way texts are interpreted; it actually *produces* interpretations.[44]

In this way, Christian communities can be understood as *interpretive* communities.[45] Scribes were influenced by

---

[43]Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 30.

[44]Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, 30.

[45]The notion of "interpretive communities" and their role in writing and readings texts are developed by Stanley Fish in his influential article "Interpreting the *Variorum*" in Is There a Text in the Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), 147-73 (especially 167-73). Also see Fish's articles "What Makes an Interpretation Acceptable?" 338-55

their interpretive communities - the people with whom they worshipped, ate, slept, and most importantly, with whom they worked in the process of transcribing texts.

In most cases, the development of interpretive communities is not a democratic process. Each interpretive community has its leaders - people who are respected for their intellectual, spiritual, and/or political prowess. These leaders are extremely influential in establishing and enforcing community boundaries and in developing the interpretive frameworks by which scripture is understood. In effect, the leaders are the intellectual and theological "movers and shapers" of these communities.

The leaders of the early church, those whom we call the church *fathers*, were the key players in the theological

==========

and "Demonstration vs. Persuasion: Two Models of Critical Activity," 356-71 in Is There a Text in the Class?. Fish's theory and its influence on biblical interpretation is discussed by Stephen D. Moore in Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 108-30. For a discussion of Fish's contributions to the field of literary criticism in general, see Temma F. Berg "Psychologies of Reading" in Tracing Literary Theory, ed. by Joseph Natoli (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 248-77; Philip Goldstein, The Politics of Literary Theory: An Introduction to Marxist Criticism (Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1990), 106-113; Wendell V. Harris, Literary Meaning: Reclaiming the Study of Literature (New York: New York University Press, 1996), 36-45, 114-17, 182-84; and Peter J. Rabinowitz, "Whirl Without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism," in Contemporary Literary Theory, eds. G. Douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), 81-100 (especially 88-89).

controversies of the first four centuries. While the nameless, faceless scribes were probably not front and center in the theological battles of the day, they were still affected by the controversies and played their own small roles in them.[46] The scribes read the works of prominent authors. They heard sermons by leaders of the community in which the leaders espoused the predominant theological views. The scribes pondered these theological and polemical positions during times of prayer, meditation, and study. Then, quite naturally, when these scribes engaged in the task of copying texts, they read the parent text through the eyes of their interpretive community, occasionally making changes in their text to fit their interpretive framework, making the text *read* what they already knew it to *mean.*

One of the competing Christian communities to which Alexandrian scribes in the 4th century belonged was defined by its adherence to the statements of the Council of Nicea,

---

[46]Ehrman argues that even though scribes were not among the *intelligentsia* of their interpretive communities, they were still affected by the christological battles. Ehrman states:

> The controversies transcended the rarified atmosphere of the Christian *literati*. The heresiologists who produced better known sources - for example, Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen - clearly enjoyed a rhetorical education. Even though scribes too were by and large among the literary elite... there is nothing to suggest that they were all, or even mostly... among the intelligensia of the faith (Orthodox Corruption, 278).

from which came the doctrine of *homoousios* (that the Son is of the *same essence* as the Father). Athanasius was one of the prominent leaders of this particular Alexandrian community. He was at the forefront of the movement that defended and maintained the doctrine of *homoousios*. I would argue that his teachings and writings were crucial in developing the interpretive framework by which Alexandrian scribes came to understand the meaning of texts. When scribes read and copied texts, their understanding of those texts would have been influenced in part by the teachings of Athanasius.

The scribes themselves were probably not the originators of many of these theological "corruptions" of scripture. Church fathers had already "corrupted" the biblical texts in their writings and sermons. In their original contexts, these corruptions served the authors' polemical purposes by providing the correct *meaning* of the text, rather than providing the verbatim wording of the text. During the process of copying particular texts, these corruptions came into the mind of the scribe (either unconsciously or consciously) because they provided the proper *meaning* of the text. In some cases, whether through unintentional gloss or intentional alteration, the scribe introduced these corruptions into the copy of the text itself, making the corruption a part of the ever-changing stream of transmission.

IV. Conclusion
The Text of the Gospels in Alexandria

In summary, this study of Athanasius' text of the Gospels has proven that, on the whole, he preserved an Alexandrian form of the Gospel text. Yet on occasion, like many authors before and after him, Athanasius corrupted his text for polemical purposes. Some of these corruptions eventually found their way into the stream of textual transmission, being placed there by the unknown scribes who belonged to interpretive communities influenced by Athanasius and/or his writings. But does this information shed any light on the history of the Alexandrian text?

The results of this study support Ehrman's hypothesis that only one type of text existed in Alexandria, but that it existed in various levels of purity.[47] The types of changes we see in Athanasius' text of the Gospels (as well as other Secondary Alexandrian witnesses) do not represent a concerted effort to revise or correct the text (*contra* Martini).[48] And while some of the variants in the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses might be due to "grammatical and stylistic polishing" (*a la* Metzger),[49] some of the changes found in these witnesses arise out of polemical situations that existed within the church during the first four

---

[47]Ehrman, Didymus, 262-67.

[48]Martini, "A Late Alexandrian Text?" 295.

[49]See Metzger, Text, 216.

centuries (CE). Ehrman is correct in stating that the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses do not represent a distinct text-type, but rather represent "a movement away from the purest line of Alexandrian text."[50] This "movement away" was conditioned at least in part by the theological controversies and polemical situations prevalent in the church.

This hypothesis concerning the text in Alexandria also helps to explain the low level of textual affinity between Athanasius' and Didymus' texts. The text lying "behind" both Athanasius' and Didymus' citations was the "purer" Alexandrian text (best represented in P^{75} and B). Athanasius and Didymus are both aligned as closely (or, in some cases, more closely) to Primary Alexandrian witnesses than they are to Secondary Alexandrian witnesses. Yet, both of them make enough changes to the "pure" text to be more closely related to the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses as a group than to the Primary Alexandrian group. In other words, there was no "Secondary Alexandrian *text*" from which they both cited. Instead, they both corrupt the "pure" line of the Alexandrian text in different places and to different degrees. These differences, added to the fact that Athanasius and Didymus share only a small portion of common text, result in their low level of textual affinity.

---

[50]Ehrman, Didymus, 264.

The preceding discussion evokes the question as to what we mean when speak of a "Secondary Alexandrian" witness? In other words, what makes a witness "Secondary Alexandrian?" Although this study of Athanasius' text does not provide enough information to answer this question, it does lead me to make some preliminary suggestions.[51] First, there are some readings that are supported exclusively or primarily among the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses.[52] Yet, my initial observations make it appear that there are not enough of these shared readings to make the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses a distinct text-type. This is due to the nature of the changes that are being made to the Alexandrian text. These changes appear sporadic and diverse. They are created in the polemical context of the theological controversies of the church. Because these corruptions are created and disseminated by highly respected and influential writers, they are eventually introduced into the textual stream. Some changes are more

==========

[51]In order to come to definitive conclusions concerning the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses, a complete analysis of these witnesses (both quantitative and qualitative) still needs to be performed.

[52]For example, the reading και διελθων δια μεσου αυτων εποπευετο και παρηγεν ουτως in Jn 8:59 is supported solely by Secondary Alexandrian witnesses and is properly designated as a "distinctive" Secondary Alexandrian reading. In addition, some of the agreements between Athanasius and the correctors of ℵ represent exclusive Secondary Alexandrian readings. For definitions of "distinctive" and "exclusive" readings, see Chapter 6.

widely supported among the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses; others are preserved by only a few. Perhaps what we see in the Secondary Alexandrian witnesses is a movement towards a distinct text-type. Yet this movement is not fully achieved due to the ascendancy of the rival Byzantine text in the late-4th and 5th centuries.

In the end, we are left with a single text-type in Alexandria. Within this textual tradition there is both a fixedness and a fluidity. The fixedness can be seen in the "pure" Alexandrian text, anchored in a careful preservation of the text through the centuries. This "pure" text acts as the source from which all deviations flow. The fluidity can be seen in the grammatical and polemical "corruptions" being made to the fixed text.

In fourth-century Alexandria, theology, canon, and text are still in a state of flux. Ironically, Athanasius contributes to both the fixedness and fluidity of the text. His writings contribute to the stabilization of both the theology and the canon of the church, which in turn lead to a stabilization of the text (although the stabilization of the text takes its form ultimately in the Byzantine text-type). Athanasius contributes to the fluidity of the NT text of Alexandria through his corruptions of that text. The changes serve his own polemical agendas, both theological and canonical, but they also influence countless other people, including the nameless, faceless

scribes responsible for transcribing the text. Athanasius' mark is seen not only in the church's history, theology, and canon, but also in the church's sacred text itself.

APPENDIX A

Indeterminable Gospel References

The following references to the Gospels are taken from critical editions of Athanasius' writings. Their precise Gospel sources cannot be determined with certainty because of parallel passages in the Gospels, harmonizations in the textual tradition of the Gospels, or complex conflations of Gospel references.

Synoptic Gospels

Matt. 2:15 (cf. Hos 11:1)
ἐξ αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου (*De Inc.* 33:33)[1]

Matt. 3:9 (= Luke 3:8)
ἡμεῖς πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν ʿΑβραάμ (*De Sent. Dion.* 3:2)

Matt. 3:17 (= Mk 1:11 = Lk 3:22; cf. Matt. 17:5 = Mk 9:7 and Lk 9:35)
οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ ηὐδόκησα (*De Decr.* 11:5)

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός (*De Sent. Dion.* 2:4)

οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ ηὐδόκησα (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 12)[2]

---

[1]This citation most likely is taken from Hosea 11:1 since it appears at the end of an extended section where Athanasius quotes from Old Testament passages to show that the incarnation of Christ was prophesied in "the books from which the Jews read."

[2]The introduction of this reference makes it clear that it is found in *both* Mt 3:17 and 17:5; "Him the Father pointed out both in the Jordan and on the Mount, saying..."

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός (*De Synodis* 35:3)

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 10)

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 15)

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς ἐν ᾧ ηὐδόκησα (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 23)

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 32)

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 62)

Matt. 4:3 (= Lk 4:3; cf. Mt. 4:6 = Lk 4:9)

εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 73)

Matt. 4:7 (= Lk 4:12; cf. Dt. 6:16)

οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου (*Apol. Fuga* 25:20)

Matt. 4:11 (= Mk 1:13)

διηκόνουν γὰρ αὐτῷ οἱ ἄγγελοι (*De Synodis* 49:4)

διὸ καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄγγελοι (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 23)

Matt. 4:23 (cf. Mt 9:35; Mt 10:1)

θεραπεύοντος τοῦ κυρίου πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν (*De Decr.* 1:6)

Matt. 5:15 (= Mk 4:21; Lk 8:16)

τοῦτον μὲν κρύπτουσιν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τῆς ὑποκρίσεως (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 10)

Matt. 6:9 (= Luke 11:2)[3]

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς εὔχεσθαι διδάσκων οὐκ εἶπεν· ὅταν δὲ προσεύχησθε, λέγετε· θεὸς ἀγένητε, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον· ὅταν προσεύχησθε, λέγετε· πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (*De Decr.* 31:2)

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς εὔχεσθαι διδάσκων οὐκ εἶπεν, ὅταν δὲ προσεύχεσθε λέγετε θεὲ ἀγένητε, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον, ὅταν δὲ προσεύχεσθε, λέγετε, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 34)

Matt. 7:21 (cf. Lk 6:46)

οὐ γὰρ ὁ λεγὼν ἁπλῶς, Κύριε, οὗτος καὶ δίδωσιν (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 42)

Matt. 7:24 (cf. Lk 6:47-48)

ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν οἰκοδομήσας ἑαυτοῦ τὴν τῆς πίστεως οἰκίαν (*Hist. Arianorum* 43:3)

Matt. 8:29 (= Mk 5:7 = Lk 8:28; cf. Mk 1:24 = Lk 4:34)

ἔα, τί σοι καὶ ἡμῖν, υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ; (δέομαί σου, μή με βασανίσῃς) (*De Inc.* 32:22-23)[4]

Matt. 9:2 (= Mk 2:5 = Lk 5:20; cf. Mt 9:5 = Mk 2:9 = Lk 5:23)

ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτία (*De Synodis* 49:5)

Matt. 10:14 (= Mk 6:11 and Lk 9:5)

ἐκτινάξαντες τοίνυν οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κονιορτὸν (*Hist. Arianorum* 34:3)

==========

[3]The following references appear to be conflations of Mt 6:9 and Lk 11:2. Lk 11:2 contains οταν προσευχησθε λεγετε instead of the Matthean ουτως ουν προσευχεσθε υμεις. Mt 6:9 contains the clause ημων ο εν τοις ουρανοις (missing in the oldest mss of Lk).

[4]This could be a quote from Mt 8:29 because it contains the first person plural ημιν whereas its parallel passages in Mk 5:7 and Lk 8:28 contain the first person singular εμοι. However, this passage could also represent a conflation of Mk 1:24 with Mk 5:7 or Lk 4:34 with Lk 8:28.

Matt. 11:5 (= Lk. 7:22)

λεπροὺς γὰρ ἐκαθάριζε, χωλοὺς περιπατεῖν ἐποίει, κωφῶν τὴν ἀκοὴν ἤνοιγε, τυφλοὺς ἀναβλέπειν ἐποίει (*De Inc.* 18:4)

χωλοὶ περιεπάτουν, τυφλοὶ ἀνέβλπον, λεπροὶ ἐκαθαρίζοντο (*De Decr.* 1:3)

Matt. 11:7 (= Lk. 7:24)

ὡς καλάμῳ τεθραυσμένῳ (*De Decr.* 8:1)

Matt. 11:13 (cf. Lk 16:16)

ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἕως Ἰωάννου προεφήτευσαν (*De Inc.* 40:19)[5]

Matt. 11:25 (= Luke 10:21)[6]

ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς (*CG* 6:21-22)

ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ (εἶτα) κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 50)

Matt. 11:27 (= Lk 10:22)

οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ᾧ ἄν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 12)[7]

==========

[5]This appears to be a quote from Mt 11:13; but the order of ο νομος and οι προφηται are reversed. This might indicate a harmonization with Lk 16:16 which reads, ο νομος και οι προφηται μεχρι Ἰωαννου.

[6]The source for these quotations cannot be identified since Mt 11:25 and Lk 10:21 are identical. Athanasius may have realized this when he used the introductory formula λεγων εν τοις ευαγγελιοις in *Oratio i contra Arianos* 50 (notice the plural "in the Gospels").

[7]This may be a common paraphrase of this verse used by some of the Alexandrian fathers. Clement, in *Str.* VII, 100, 4 (III, 78, 3), cites this verse in exactly the same form: ουδεις γαρ γινωσκει τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος και ω αν ον υιος αποκαλυψη. In these four adaptations from *Orationes i-ii contra Arianos*, it appears that Athanasius

οὐδεὶς ἐπιγῖνώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 39)[8]

οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 22)

οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 22)

Matt. 12:24 (= Mk 3:22 = Lk 11:15; cf. Mt 9:34 and Jn 8:48-52)

πῶς γὰρ οἷόν τέ ἐστι δαίμονα εἶναι τὸν τοὺς δαίμονας ἀπελαύνοντα; εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἁπλῶς δαίμονας ἤλαυνε, καλῶς ἂν ἐνομίσθη τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἰσχύειν αὐτὸν κατὰ τῶν ἐλαττόνων, ὁποῖα καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι θέλοντες αὐτὸν ὑβρίζειν ἔλεγον αὐτῷ (*De Inc.* 48:29-33)

ἔχειν ὑπόνοιαν τὸν Βεελζεβοὺλ ὀνομάζοντες (*De Decr.* 1:6)

Matt. 12:30 (= Lk 11:23)

μὴ συνάγοντες μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν, σκορπίζουσι μετὰ τοῦ διαβόλου (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 1)

Matt. 12:32 (= Lk 12:10)

ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἔξει ἄφεσιν· (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50)[9]

==========

used the first two words of the verse (i.e. ουδεις (επι)γινωσκει) and then jumped to the pertinent part of the verse for his discussion (i.e. τον πατερα ει μη ο υιος). See the discussion in Chapter 7.

[8]Again, this represents a common paraphrase of this verse cited by some Alexandrians. Clement, in *Q.d.s* 8,1 (III,164,25) cites the verse as ουδεις επιγινωσκει ει μη ο υιος. The object of the verb, ο πατερα, is implied in Clement's context.

[9]This adaptation appears to be a conflation of Mt 12:32 and Lk 12:10. The primary text seems to be from Mt, since it does not contain the Lucan πας (before ος) and it has the Matthean ειπη instead of the Lucan ερει. On the other hand, it follows the Lucan εις τον υιον του ανθρωπου rather than the Matthean κατα του υιου του ανθρωπου.

Matt. 12:34 (= Lk 6:45)

ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ τὰ περισσεύματα τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 22)

Matt. 13:8 (= Mk 4:8; cf. Mt 13:23 = Mk 4:20)

ἐπεί περ φέρει καὶ αὐτὸς καρπὸν τὸν πριάκοντα... τὸν γὰρ τέλειον καρπόν τὴν ἑκαντοντάδα ἐβλάστησεν (*Ep. ad Amun*)

Matt. 13:25 (cf. Matt. 13:39)

εἰ θαρροῦσιν οἷς ἐφεῦρον αὐτοὶ κακοῖς ἐπισπείραντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ διαβόλου τὴν κακοφροσύνην (*De Decr.* 2:4)

Matt. 13:55 (= Mk 6:3; cf. Lk 4:22)

οὐκ οὗτὸς ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱὸς; (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 50)

Matt. 14:19-21 (= Mk 6:39-44 and Lk 9:14-17 and Jn 6:9-12)

καὶ ἀπὸ πέντε ἄρτων ἐκορέσθησαν πεντακισχίλιοι (*De Decr.* 1:3)

θεικῶς δὲ χορτάζοντα ἀπὸ πέντε ἄρτων πεντακισχίλιους (*De Sent. Dion.* (9:4)

Matt. 14:25 (Mk 6:48; cf. Jn 6:19)

διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ὡς δεσπότης ἐπέβαινε καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ καὶ περιεπάτει ὡς ἐπὶ γῆς (*De Inc.* 18:4)

Matt. 15:4-6 (= Mk 7:10-13; cf. Ex. 20:12)

καὶ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ δεδωκότος ἐντολήν· τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ μητέρα σου και ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτω ἀντενομοθέτουν κἀκεῖνοι, τὴν τιμὴν εἰς ἀτιμίαν μεταφέροντες, καὶ ἀργυρίου τὸπρος τοὺς γονέας καθῆκον παρὰ τῶν τέκνων ἀντικαταλλάσσοντες (*Apol. Fuga* 2:8-10)

Matt. 15:18-19 (= Mk 7:20-21)

εἶτα ἀπάγει καὶ πόθεν ἐξερχόμενα τὰ ἀπὸ καρδίας (*Ep. ad Amun*)

Matt. 16:16 (= Mk 8:29 and Lk 9:21; cf. Jn 6:69)[10]

σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος (*De Sent. Dion.* 8:3)

σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ζῶντος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 18)

σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ζῶντος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 62)

σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 73)

Matt. 16:24 (= Mk 8:34 and Lk 9:23)

εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν (*Hist. Arianorum* 33:2)

εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν (*Hist. Arianorum* 67:2)

Matt. 19:6 (= Mk 10:9)

ἅ ὁ θεὸς ἔζευξεν ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω (*Apol. Fuga* 17:15)

Matt. 19:26 (= Mk. 10:27 and Lk. 18:27)

ὅτι τε ἅ καταλαμβάνουσιν ἄνθρωποι ὡς ἀδύνατα, ταῦτα αὐτὸς ἐπιδείκνυται δυνατά (*De Inc.* 1:16-17)

Matt. 19:27 (= Mk. 10:28 and Lk. 18:28)

ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμέν σοι (*Ep. ad Monachos* 1:1)[11]

Matt. 20:28 (= Mk 10:45)

ἦλθε γοῦν οὐχ ἵνα διακονηθῇ ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα διακονήσῃ (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 68)

==========

[10]For all of these citations, Athanasius states that Peter made this confession, but he does not indicate from which "Gospel" (εν δε τω ευαγγελιω) he is citing. The long form (Χριστος - ζωντος) is found in Mt, but the other Gospels have mss that support this reading.

[11]This reference is probably not from Lk (which has αφεντες τα ιδια instead of αφηκαμεν παντα), but it impossible to determine whether Mt or Mk is its source.

διὰ τοῦτο εἰ καὶ ἀπέθανε διὰ τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων λύτρον (*De Inc.* 21:7)

ἔπειτα εἰ ὁ θάνατος τοῦ κυρίου λύτρον ἐστὶ πάντων (*De Inc.* 25:3)

Matt. 22:21 (= Mk 12:17 and Lk 20:25)

ἀπόδοτε γέγραπται τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ (*Hist. Arianorum* 44:7 - Citation taken from a *Letter of Hosius to Constantius* [355-358 CE])

ἀπόδοτε τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 52)

Matt. 22:29 (= Mk 12:24)

πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν (*Ep. Festales XXXIX* 6)

μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς, μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 52)

Matt. 23:17 (= Mt 23:19)

ὡς ἀληθῶς μωροὶ καὶ τυφλοί (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 19)

Matt. 24:15 (= Mk 13:14-16 and Lk 21:20-21; cf. Daniel 9:27)[12]

ἂν εἴποι τοῦτ᾽ εἶναι τὸ διὰ τοῦ Δανιὴλ εἰρημένον βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως (*Hist. Arianorum* 77:1)

Matt. 24:31 (= Mk 13:27)

ἀποστελεῖ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ (*De Synodis* 49:4)

==========

[12]This probably was not taken from Lk 21:20 which does not mention το βδελυγμα. The context seems to indicate that its source is Daniel 9:27.

Matt. 24:42 (= Mk 13:35)
Matt. 24:44 (= Lk 17:40)

γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι καὶ γρηγορεῖτε, ὅτι ᾗ οὐκ οἴδατε ὥρᾳ ἔρχεται (*De Inc.* 56:23-24)[13]

Matt. 25:21 (= Mt 25:23)

εὖ δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ (*De Decr.* 10:2)

εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου (*Ep. Festales XL* in *Cosmam Indicopleustam*)

εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου (*Ep. Festales XLII* in *Cosmam Indicopleustam*)

συνεισέλθωμεν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυριοῦ ἄπαυστόν τε καὶ ὄντως μένουσαν ἐν οὐρανοῖς χαράν (*Ep. Festales II* in *Cosmam Indicopleustam*)

εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Κύριου χαρὰν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν (*Ep. Festales VI* in *Cosmam Indicopleustam*)

Matt. 25:40 (cf. Mt 18:6)

ἐφ᾽ ὅσον γὰρ ἐποιήσατε ἑνὶ τῶν μικρῶν τούτων, ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε (*Hist. Arianorum* 61:1)[14]

Matt. 26:4 (cf. Jn 11:53)

ὡς Ἰουδαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον κατὰ μόνας (*Apol. Contra Arianos* 82:3)

Matt. 27:54 (= Mk 15:39 and Lk 23:47)

ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστι (*De Sent. Dion* 4:1)[15]

==========

[13]This reference is a conflation of two verses. Mt 24:42 has a parallel in Mk 13:35 and Mt 24:44 has a parallel in Lk 17:40. It is more likely that the passage being cited is a conflation from the two verses in Mt 24 rather than a conflation from two separate gospels, but because of the uncertainty, it was not included in the analysis.

[14]This might represent a conflation of Mt 25:40 and Mt 18:6, the latter which contains ενα των μικρων τουτων.

[15]A reference to Mt 27:54 is also found in a single

Matt. 27:59 (= Mk 15:46 and Lk 23:53)

τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἑλίξας ᾿Ιωσὴφ σινδόνι ἀπέθετο ἐν τῷ Γολγοθᾷ (*Ep. ad Epictetum* 6)[16]

Mark 1:24 (= Lk. 4:34)

οἶδαμέν σε τίς εἶ· σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (*De Inc.* 32:22)

Mark 12:29 (= Dt 6:4)

κύριος ὁ θεὸς εἷς ἐστι (*CG* 6:21)

Luke 4:30 (cf. textual variant at Jn. 8:59)

διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο καὶ παρῆγεν οὕτως (*Apol. Fuga* 12:23-24)[17]

ὁ μὲν οὖν Κύριος... καὶ τὰς ἐπιβουλὰς ἐκκλίνων οὕτως διήρχετο, και διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο (*Apol. Fuga* 15:20)

Luke 14:26 (cf. Lk 14:27,33; cf. Mt 16:24 = Mk 8:34 = Lk 9:23)

ὁ θέλων εἶναὶ μου μαθητής (*Hist. Arianorum* 33:2)[18]

==========

manuscript (d) of Athanasius' *De Incarnatione*: οὗτος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐστι (*De Inc.* 45:8), but this was probably not in Athanasius' original text. For other Gospel references exclusive to this manuscript cf. Lk 23:4; Jn 10:18; and Jn 18:38.

[16]This allusion is interesting in that it states that Joseph *buried* the body at Golgotha. This allusion might have Mt 27:59 at its base because of the proximity of σωμα, ελιχας, and ᾿Ιωσηφ in that passage. Joseph name is further removed in Mk and missing in Lk, but the uncertainty of source is still too great to include in the critical apparatus.

[17]This could reflect a variant of Jn 8:59 which is quoted immediately before this. Some mss of Jn 8:59 contain both of the above clauses.

[18]This reference probably represents a conflation of Lk 14:26 (or parallels) with Lk 9:23 (or parallels).

Luke 15:2 (cf. Lk 19:7)

ὅμως καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα διεγόγγυζον κατὰ τοῦς Ἰουδαίους (*De Decr.* 1:1)

Luke 19:10 (cf. textual variant at Mt 18:11)[19]

ἦλθον τὸ ἀπολόμενον εὑρεῖν καὶ σῶσαι (*De Inc.* 14:9-10)[20]

ἦλθον σῶσαι καὶ εὑρεῖν τὸ ἀπολωλός (*De Inc.* 15:36-37)

Luke 19:17,19

καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ δέκα πόλεων, ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ πέντε καθίσταται (*De Decr.* 10:2)[21]

Luke 23:4 (= John 18:38; cf. Jn 19:4,6)

οὐδὲν εὑρίσκω ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ κακόν (*De Inc.* 45:8)[22]

==========

[19]The following two references, although Athanasius presents them as the very words of Jesus, are not found in the NT. The passage with the closest verbal affinities is Lk 19:10 which states, "For the Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost (ζητησαι και σωσαι το απολωλος)," and a parallel passage found in a few manuscripts of Mt 18:11 which states, "The Son of Man came to save the lost (σωσαι το απολωλος)." Perhaps the verb ευρειν is taken from Lk 15:5 (= Mt 18:13) or Lk 15:9.

[20]Athanasius seems to indicate that this reference is found in more than one Gospel. He introduces this reference with the following introductory formula: "The most holy Son of the Father... as he himself says in the Gospels..." (ὁ πανάγιος τοῦ πατρὸς υἱός... ᾗ φησι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις·...)

[21]The verb καθισταται may represent a conflation with Mt 25:21,23.

[22]This passage is a variant found only in a single manuscript (d) of Athanasius' *De Incarnatione* and was probably not in his original text (cf. Mt 27:54; Jn 10:18; and Jn 18:38).

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

John 1:18 (cf. Jn 1:14, 3:16, and 3:18)

μονογενὴς υἱός (*Dep. Arii* 3 = *De Decr.* 35:12)

διὸ καὶ ὁ τούτου Λόγος ὢν ἐστι καὶ οὐ σύνθετος ἀλλ᾽ εἷς καὶ μονογενὴς θεὸς (*CG* 41:5-6)

εἰ μὴ τοῦ... Λόγου, καὶ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντος Υἱοῦ μονογενοῦς ἀληθινοῦ (*De Inc.* 20:1)

ὁ μονογενὴς θεός (*De Synodis* 18:5 - taken from a treatise of Asterius)

John 2:9 (cf. Jn. 4:46)

τίς δὲ ἰδὼν καὶ τὴν ὑδατων ἀλλασσομένην οὐσίαν καὶ εἰς οἶνον μεταβάλλουσαν (*De Inc.* 18:6) [All]

τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνος ἐγίνετο (*De Decr.* 1:3) [All]

John 5:3,10,16-17

διατί ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύεις τὸν παραλυτικόν, (καὶ τὸν ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλὸν τότε ποιεῖς ἀναβλέπειν;) (*De Decr.* 1:5)[23]

==========

[23]Athanasius gives this reference in the context of discussing the Jews complaints against Jesus. Athanasius states that the Jews asked Jesus the following questions: "Why did you heal the paralytic on the Sabbath, and why did you make the man born blind to see (cf. Jn 9:16)? These two questions are not found in the Gospels, but they allude to two healing miracles recorded in the Fourth Gospel. The story of the healing of the paralytic in Jn 5:2-19 presupposes that the Jews questioned Jesus himself. Jn 5:16 states, "On account of this, the Jews persecuted Jesus because he did these things on the Sabbath." Verse 5:17 goes on to state, "But Jesus *answered* them..." even though the Fourth Gospel records no question. Athanasius produces the implied questions.

The first question might be important text critically because it contains the word παραλυτικον. This word appears only in a variant of Jn 5:3 found in D and the Old Latin manuscripts.

John 5:21

καὶ αὐτοζωή, καὶ θύρα, καὶ ποιμήν, καὶ ὁδός, καὶ βασιλεύς, καὶ ἡγεμών, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι σωτήρ, καὶ ζωοποιός, καὶ φῶς, καὶ πρόνοια τῶν πάντων (*CG* 47:4-6)[24]

John 6:68

τὰ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Κυρίου ῥήματα ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχει (*Apol. Fuga* 23:19-20)[25]

John 8:12 (cf. John 9:5)

καὶ αὐτοζωή, καὶ θύρα, καὶ ποιμήν, καὶ ὁδός, καὶ βασιλεύς, καὶ ἡγεμών, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι σωτήρ, καὶ ζωοποιός, καὶ φῶς, καὶ πρόνοια τῶν πάντων (*CG* 47:4-6)[26]

John 8:44[27]

τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτῶν τὸν διάβολον (*Apol. Fuga* 10:9-10)

πάντα δὲ κατὰ τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτῶν τὸν διάβολον (*De Decretis* 29:1)

ὡς ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῆς ὁ διάβολος (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 1)

==========

[24]This list of titles for Jesus contains the name, ζωοποιος = "giver of life." This word appears twice in Jn 5:21, which describes both the Father and the Son "giving life." It is very uncertain whether Athanasius is alluding to this verse or citing a common title used to describe Jesus in the early church.

[25]Athanasius lists this as one of the things which every Christian should confess. The context does not make it seem like he is referring to a biblical passage, but it does have verbal affinity to Jn 6:68.

[26]Jesus describes himself as "the light," το φως, in both Jn 8:12 and Jn 9:5. It is not clear whether Athanasius is making a reference to either of these two verse or using a common title of Jesus found in the early church.

[27]Athanasius is probably not alluding to Jn 8:44 in any of the following three references. He does not give an introductory formula for any of them. These references to "his father, the devil" more likey reflect how Athanasius' language was influenced by scriptural phrases.

John 9:1-34[28]

καὶ τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνοίγοντα (*De Inc.* 18:4)

καὶ ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλὸν ἐποίησε βλέπειν (*De Inc.* 49:1)

(διατί ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύεις τὸν παραλυτικόν,) καὶ τὸν ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλὸν τότε ποιεῖς ἀναβλέπειν; (*De Decr.* 1:5)[29]

John 10:5

ὡς μισθωτὸς καὶ ἀλλότριος (*Ep. Encyclica* 6:1)[30]

John 10:7 (= Jn 10:9)

ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ θύρα (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 64)

καὶ αὐτοζωή, καὶ θύρα, καὶ ποιμήν, καὶ ὁδός, καὶ βασιλεύς, καὶ ἡγεμών, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι σωτήρ, καὶ ζωοποιός, καὶ φῶς, καὶ πρόνοια τῶν πάντων (*CG* 47:4-6)[31]

==========

[28]The following references all allude to the healing of the man born blind in Jn 9:1-41. Various forms of the words "born blind" (cf. 9:1,2,19,20,32); "opened" (cf. 9:10,14) and "caused to see" appear in several places in this story, as can be seen in the following list:

Jn 9:1, NA^{26} = τυφλον εκ γενετης
Jn 9:15, NA^{26} = παλιν ουν ηρωτων αυτον και οι Φαρισαιοι πως ανεβλεψεν;
Jn 9:19, NA^{26} = πως ουν βλεπει αρτι;
Jn 9:26, NA^{26} = πως ηνοιξεν σου τους αφθαλμους;
Jn 9:32, NA^{26} = οτι ηνεωξεν τις οφθαλμους τυφλου γεγεννημενου

[29]Cf. the footnote to Jn 5:3. Again in this case, the Jews question does not appear in the Fourth Gospel. The Pharisees may have questioned Jesus in Jn 9:39-41, but none of the questions appear in John's text, Athanasius simply supplies the question.

[30]Athanasius states that Gregory is an Arian, and has been sent to the Arians, and "as a hireling and a stranger," Gregory makes use of the Governor to afflict the people of the true Church. Athanasius' use of "a hireling and a stranger" may be an allusion to Jn 10:5 and 10:12-13, but it is not certain.

[31]See footnote to Jn 5:21. The title "door" (θυρα) may be

τὸν δὲ ἀληθῶς υἱὸν κατ᾽ ἐπίνοιαν μόνον λέγεσθαι λόγον ὡς ἄμπελόν καὶ ὁδὸν καὶ θύραν καὶ ξύλον ζωῆς (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 37)[32]

John 10:12,13

ὡς μισθωτὸς καὶ ἀλλότριος (*Ep. Encyclica* 6:1)[33]

John 10:11 = John 10:14

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ποιμήν (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 12)

καὶ αὐτοζωή, καὶ θύρα, καὶ ποιμήν, καὶ ὁδός, καὶ βασιλεύς, καὶ ἡγεμών, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι σωτήρ, καὶ ζωοποιός,[34] καὶ φῶς, καὶ πρόνοια τῶν πάντων (*CG* 47:4-6)

John 10:18

ἐξουσίαν ἔχω θεῖναι τὴν ψυχήν μου, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω λαβεῖν αὐτήν, τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς διαλύσει (*De Inc.* 24:22-26:4)[35]

John 11:1-44; 12:1

(ὅτε γοῦν αὐτὸν κλαίοντα λέγει, οἴδεν ὅτι ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος ὁ κύριος δείκνυσι τὸ μὲν κλαίειν τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου,) ἐγειρει δὲ Λάζαρον ὡς θέος (*De Sent. Dion.* 9:4)

==========

an allusion to Jn 10:7 or 10:9, but it probably represents a common title attributed to Jesus by the early church.

[32]See preceding footnote.

[33]See footnote to Jn 10:5.

[34]See footnote to Jn 5:21. The title "shepherd" (ποιμην) may be an allusion to Jn 10:11 or 10:14, but it more likely represents a common title attributed to Jesus by the early church.

[35]This passage is a variant found only in a single manuscript (d) of Athanasius' *De Incarnatione* and was probably not in his original text (cf. Mt 27:54; Lk 23:4; and Jn 18:38).

John 14:6 (cf. Jn 11:25)

ἐγω εἰμι ἡ ζωή (*De Decr.* 12:3)

ἐγω εἰμι ἡ ζωή (*De Synodis* 41:6)

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ζωὴ (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 19)

John 14:16-17 (cf. Jn 14:26; 15:26; 16:7,13)

τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (*De Synodis* 8:6 - quotation from the Confession of the 3rd Council of Sirmius [359 CE])

τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (*De Synodis* 30:7 - quotation from the 10th confession of Nike and Constantinople [359-360 CE])

ἀποστελῶ ὑμῖν τὸν Παράκλητον, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (*Oratio I contra Arianos* 48)

καὶ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸν παράκλητον, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (*De Synodis* 24:4 - quotation from the personal faith of Theophronius, 3rd Confession of Antioch [341 CE])

John 15:1 (= Jn 15:5)

καὶ ὅτι ἄμπελος... (*De Sent. Dion.* 26:1,2)

τὸν δὲ ἀληθῶς υἱὸν κατ᾽ ἐπίνοιαν μόνον λέγεσθαι λόγον ὡς ἄμπελόν καὶ ὁδὸν καὶ θύραν καὶ ξύλον ζωῆς (*Oratio II contra Arianos* 37)[36]

John 18:9

Οὐδένα τῶν σῶν ἀπώλεσα (*Apol. Const.* 35:25)[37]

==========

[36]See footnote to Jn 10:7. The title "vine" (αμπελος) may be an allusion to Jn 15:1 or 15:5, but it more likely represents a common title attributed to Jesus by the early church.

[37]Although this reference has verbal affinities to Jn 18:9, the context does not indicate that Athanasius is alluding to scripture. Athanasius is pleading to Constantius to show him kindness so that Constantius can say both in the present and at the day of judgment to Christ, "None of Yours have I lost." This again is an

John 18:12

ἠν σπείραν καὶ τὸν χιλίαρχον (*De Decr.* 2:2)[38]

John 18:38, 19:4, 19:6 (See Luke 23:4)

οὐδὲν εὑρίσκω ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ κακόν (*De Inc.* 45:8)[39]

John 19:24 (= Ps 21:17-19)

Ὤρυξαν χεῖρας μου καὶ πόδας μου· ἐξηρίθμησαν πάντα τὰ ὀστᾶ μου, διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον (*De Inc.* 35:12-13)[40]

==========

example of how Athanasius' language is infused with scriptural statements.

[38]Although this reference has verbal affinities to Jn 18:12, the context does not indicate that Athanasius is alluding to scripture. Athanasius is describing how the Arians will first invent excuses and then turn to outrage and "threaten the band and the captain." This is another example of how Athanasius' language has been influenced by scriptural wording.

[39]This passage is a variant found only in a single manuscript (d) of Athanasius' *De Incarnatione* and was probably not in his original text (cf. Mt 27:54; Lk 23:4; and Jn 10:18).

[40]In the context, Athanasius first quotes from Moses (Dt 28:66). He then states: "And next, the prophets after him witness to this," he quotes from Jer 11:19, and then states, "and again" and then gives the above quotation. Thus it is highly likely that Athanasius is citing from Ps 21:17-19, but his citation may have been influenced by the Johannine form.

APPENDIX B

Gospel References in Athanasius' Writings Not Available in Critical Additions

The following collection represents the Gospel references found in Athanasius' writings that are not available in critical editions.[1] The source for this material is Migne's *Patrologiae Graeca* Vols. 25-27. Under each biblical chapter/verse heading, the references are listed according to the order of Athanasius' writings as they appear in Migne. The following works of Athanasius are included:

Volume 25:

In illud: Omnia mihi tradita sunt	25,208-220
Epistula ad Dracontium	25,524-533
Epistula ad episcopos Aegypti et Libyae	25,537-593

Volume 26:[2]

Epistulae i-iv ad Serapionem	26,529-648
In illud: Qui dixerit verbum in filium[3]	26,648-676
Tomus ad Antiochenos	26,796-808
Subscriptio Paulini Antiocheni	26,809
Epistula ad Jovianum (no references to the Gospels)	26,813-820

==========

[1]The following Gospel references do not include references found in the catenae (see Appendix D).

[2]Gospel references found in *Oratio iii contra Arianos* are located in Appendix C.

[3]Migne includes this work as part of *Ep. iv ad Serapionem*, chapters 7-23.

Petiones Arianorum (no references to the Gospels)	26,820-824
Vita Antonii	26,837-976
Epistula ad Afros episcopos	26,1029-1048
Epistula ad Adelphium	26,1071-1084
Epistula ad Maximum	26,1085-1089
Epistula ad Joannem et Antiochum presbyteros (no references to the Gospels)	26,1165-1168
Epistula ad Palladium (no references to the Gospels)	26,1168-1169
Epistula ii ad monachos (no references to the Gospels)	26,1185-1188
Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est	26,1240-1244
Epistula ad Eupsychium	26,1245-1248
Epistula ad Epiphanium	26,1257-1260

Volume 27:

Epistula ad Marcellinum	27,12-45

Gospel references from the following dubious and spurious Athanasian writings have not been collected.[4]

Volume 25:

Expositio Fidei	25,200-208

Volume 26:

Oratio iv contra Arianos	26,468-525
De incarnatione et contra Arianos	26,984-1028
De incarnatione contra Apollinarium libri ii	26,1093-1165
Epistulae ii ad Luciferum (Latin)	26,1181-1186

==========

[4]For arguments against the authenticity of these works see Chapter 3.

Liber de trinitate et spiritu sancto (Latin)	26,1191-1218
Alia fragmenta	26,1223-1230
Interpretatio in symbolum	26,1231-1232
	26,1233-1262
Sermo major de fide	26,1262-1292
	26,1291-1296
Sermo de patientia	26,1297-1310
Sermo in ramos palmarum	26,1309-1314
	26,1313-1326
De azymis	26,1327-1332
	26,1331-1338
Epistulae festales (Syriac translated into Latin)	26,1351-1432

Volume 27:

Argumentum in psalmos	27,56-60
De titulis psalmorum	27,548-1344
Homilia in Canticum canticorum	27,1349-1361

A few words of caution concerning this material are necessary. First, as with all biblical references found in Migne's *PG*, these references might not accurately reflect Athanasius' biblical text (the manuscripts of Athanasius' texts used by Migne could have been corrupted, especially towards the dominant Byzantine text). Second, the references have not been classified according to the categories of citation, adaptation, or allusion. Finally, the references have not been rigorously examined for possible conflations, harmonizations, or affinities to parallel biblical passages. Their book, chapter, and verse designations are those given by Migne. On account of these matters, these Gospel references should be used only with

extreme caution. Hopefully, critical editions of these works of Athanasius will be forthcoming.

References to the Gospel of Matthew

Matt. 1:23

ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱὸν, καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουὴλ, ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 6)

Matt. 2:11

τοὺς δὲ μάγους ὑπέταξε προσκυνούμενος ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν (*Ep. ad Maximum* 4)

Matt 2:13-14

καὶ παιδίον μὲν εἰς Αἴγυπτον κατῆλθε (*Ep. ad Maximum* 4)

Matt. 3:3

(ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης) εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους ὑμῶν (*Vita Antonii* 20)

Matt. 3:16

ἀνθρωπίνως ἐβαπτίζετο, δι᾽ ἣν ἐφόρει σάρκα, λέγεται καταβεβηκέναι ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (*Ep. ad Serapion IV*.6)

Matt. 3:17

οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν ᾧ ηὐδόκησα (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.1)

Matt. 4:1

τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν ἔρημον (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.4)

Matt. 4:3

(πειράζων ἐν τῷ ὄρει, οὐκ ἔλεγεν· εἰ καὶ σὺ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς ὄντων ἄλλων· ἀλλ᾽,) εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, (ὡς μόνου ὄντος αὐτοῦ) (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 14)

Matt. 4:9

πεσόντες προσκυνήσατε (*Vita Antonii* 37)

Matt. 4:10

ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· γέγραπται γάρ· κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσις (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 3)

ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ. γέγραπται γὰρ· κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις (*Vita Antonii* 37)

Matt. 4:11

οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ (*Ep. ad Serapion I.*11)

Matt. 4:19

καὶ ἁλιεὺς ἀνθρώπων γέγονε (*Ep. ad Dracontium* 8)

Matt. 4:20

πῶς οἱ μὲν ἀπόστολοι πάντα καταλιπόντες ἠκολούθησαν τῷ σωτῆρι (*Vita Antonii* 2)

Matt. 5:15

οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἅψας λύχνον τίθησιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσι τοῖς εἰσερχομένοις (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 18)

κρύπτοντες ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τὸν ἑαυτῶν λύχνον, ἵνα νομίζηται φαίνειν (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 18)

Matt. 5:48

γίνεσθε τέλειοι, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειος ἐστι (*Ep. ad Afros* 7)

Matt. 6:6

προσηύχετο δὲ συνεχῶς, μαθὼν, ὅτι δεῖ κατ᾽ ἰδίαν προσεύχεσθαι ἀδιαλείπτως (*Vita Antonii* 3)

Matt. 6:25

μὴ μεριμνήσητε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε· (*Vita Antonii* 45)

Matt. 6:30

μηδὲ τὸν χόρτον ἀμφιέννυσθαι ἄνευ τοῦ θεοῦ (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 1)

Matt. 6:34

μὴ μεριμνήσητε περὶ τῆς αὔριον (*Vita Antonii* 3)

Matt. 7:2

καὶ ἐδέναι ὅτι οἵῳ κρίματι κρίνουσι, κριθήσονται (*Vita Antonii* 84)

Matt. 7:15

προσέχετε (λέγων) ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασι προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσι λύκοι ἅρπαγες (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 3)

Matt. 7:22

κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν; (*Vita Antonii* 38)

Matt. 7:24

καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν οἰκοδομήσας ἑαυτοῦ τὴν τῆς πίστεως οἰκίαν (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 4)

Matt. 8:2

κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 3)

Matt. 8:17 (= Isa. 53:4)

[λέγοντα διὰ τοῦ Ἡσαίου] αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβε (*Ep. ad Marcellinum* 7)

Matt. 8:26

καὶ ἡ μὲν θάλαττα ἐπαφρίζουσα τοῖς κύμασιν ἤκουσε τοῦ σαρκωθέντος λόγου, καὶ πέπαυται τοῦ χειμῶνος (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 3)

Matt. 8:29

σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 3)

σὺ εἶ (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ) ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 14)

Matt. 8:31 (cf. Mark 5:12)

παρεκάλουν (γὰρ, ὡς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελιῳ γέγραπται) τὸν κύριον λέγοντες ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τοὺς χοίρους (*Vita Antonii* 29)

Matt. 9:20

...πιστεύσαντες τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ τὴν αἱμορῥοοῦσαν θεραπεύσαντι (*Vita Antonii* 58)

οὕτως καὶ ἡ αἱμορῥοοῦσα γυνὴ, πιστεύσασα καὶ μόνον ἁψαμένη τοῦ κρασπέδου, ἰάθη (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 3)

Matt. 10:8

ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύτε δαίμονας ἐκβάλλετε δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε (*Vita Antonii* 83)

Matt. 10:20

οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν (*Ep. ad Serapion I.6*)

Matt. 10:25

εἰ τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐπεκάλεσαν (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 17)

Matt. 10:29

ὥστε μηδὲ στρουθίον ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς πεσεῖν εἰς τὴν γήν (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 1)

Matt. 10:40

ὁ γὰρ τιμῶν τὸν υἱὸν τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτὸν, καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος τὸν υἱὸν, δέχεται σὺν αὐτῷ τὸν πατέρα (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 4)

Matt. 11:27

πάντα μοι παρεδόθη, ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει, τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλῦψαι (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 1)

οὐδεὶς γινώσκει, τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 5)

οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 16)

οὐδεὶς οἶδε τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, οὐδὲ τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ (*Ep. ad Serapion II.*9)

Matt. 11:28

(ὡς ὁ Ματθαῖός φησιν) δεῦτε πρὸς μὲ, πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 2)

δεῦτε πρὸς μὲ, πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 23)

Matt. 11:29

μάθετε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ ὅτι πραΰς εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ (*Ep. ad Marcellinum* 13)

Matt. 12:19 (= Isa. 42:2)

οὐκ ἐρίσει γὰρ, οὔτε κραυγάσει οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις τῆς φωνης αὐτῶν (*Vita Antonii* 35)

Matt. 12:24

(οἱ μὲν φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον·) οὗτος οὐκ ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια εἰ μὴ ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων + (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 8)

(εἰ δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες·) ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 18)

Matt. 12:25

\+ (ὁ δὲ κύριος) εἰδὼς τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα καθ᾽ ἑαυτὴν ἐρημοῦται (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 8)

Matt. 12:28

εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.6)

(καὶ εἰρηκώς·) εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 8)

Matt. 12:31

(λοιπὸν ἐπιφέρει·) διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἡ δὲ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται + (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 8)

ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 18)

Matt. 12:32

(ὅς δ᾽ ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν) οὔτε ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.3)

ὅς δ᾽ ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.7)

\+ καὶ ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρωποῦ, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ᾽ ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθῆσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 8)

ὃς δ᾽ ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθῆσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 23)

Matt. 12:36

οὐ γὰρ μόνον περὶ τῶν ἔργων ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ἀργοῦ ῥήματος ἀποδοῦναι λόγον ἔχομεν τῷ κριτῇ (*Ep. ad Marcellinum* 15)

Matt. 13:25

ἐπισπείρωσι τοῦτο καθεύδουσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 3)

Matt. 13:41

ἀποστελεῖ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.11)

Matt. 13:49

ἐξελεύσονται οἱ ἄγγελοι (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.11)

Matt. 13:54

πόθεν τούτῳ ἡ σοφία αὕτη; (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 17)

πόθεν τούτῳ ἡ σοφία αὕτη; (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 20)

Matt. 13:55

οὐκ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός; (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 16)

Matt. 15:13

πᾶσα μὲν φυτεία, ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ ὁ οὐράνιος, ἐκριζωθήσεται (*Ep. ad Afros* 2)

Matt. 16:16

(ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ὡμολόγησεν ὅτι) σὺ εἶ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.8)

Matt. 17:5

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 13)

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 15)

Matt. 17:20

ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ· μετάβηθι ἐντεῦθεν καὶ μεταβήσεται καὶ οὐδὲν ἀδυνατήσει ὑμῖν (*Vita Antonii* 83)

Matt.18:6

[εἰ γὰρ] ὁ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν σκανδαλίζων, ἔλοιτ᾽ ἂν μύλον ὀνικὸν περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ κρεμασθῆναι, καὶ καταποντισθῆναι (*Ep. ad Dracontium* 1)

Matt. 18:10

ἤ τάχα καὶ διὰ τοὺς διὰ παντὸς θεωροῦντας τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, διαμαρτύρεται νῦν ἀγγέλους, ἕνεκά γε τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μικρῶν (*Ep. ad Serapion I.*14)

Matt. 19:21

εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ὕπαγε, πώλησον πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά σοι, καὶ δὸς πτωχοῖς καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολούθει μοι, καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς (*Vita Antonii* 2)

τίς τε καὶ πόση τούτοις ἐλπὶς ἐν οὐρανοὶς ἀπόκειται (*Vita Antonii* 2)

Matt. 22:29

πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδοτες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 9)

Matt. 24:2

λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ἐν αὐτῷ, ὅς οὐ κατελύθη (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 7)

Matt 24:24

ἐγερθήσονται ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ ψευδόχριστοι, καὶ δώσουσι σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ τέρατα, ὥστε πλανᾶσθαι, εἰ δυνατὸν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς· + (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 1)

ἐγερθήσονται ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται, ὥστε πλανῆσαι πολλούς (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 4)

Matt 24:24-25

\+ ἰδοὺ προείρηκα ὑμῖν (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 1)

Matt. 25:12

(ἀπεκρίνατο·) ᾽αμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς (*Vita Antonii* 38)

Matt. 25:27

ἔδει σε βαλεῖν τὰ δηνάριά μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις, ἵνα ἐλθὼν κἀγὼ παρ᾽ ἐκείνων ἀπαιτήσω (*Ep. ad Dracontium* 2)

Matt. 25:46

ἀπελεύσονται μὲν ἐκεῖνοι εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον, οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 23)

Matt. 26:45

καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν, καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλῶν (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 20)

Matt. 26:62-63

τῷ δὲ Καϊάφᾳ μὴ ἀποκρινόμενος πρὸς τὴν φλυαρίαν (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 1)

Matt. 27:14 (= Mk 15:5)

οὐκ ἔτι ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 1)

Matt. 27:19

[ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον] ἐχρημάτιζε τῇ τούτου γυναικὶ (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 1)

Matt. 27:24

ὡς ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἐνίψατο τὰς χεῖρας (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 6)

νιψαμένῳ γὰρ τῷ Πιλάτῳ καὶ καταλαβομένῳ τὴν συκοφαντίαν τῶν τότε Ἰουδαίων (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 1)

Matt. 27:40

(μετὰ τῶν παραδευόντων τότε Ἰουδαίων τὸν κρεμάμενον ἐπὶ ξύλου) εἰ υἱός ἐστι τοῦ θεοῦ, σώσει αὐτόν (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 1)

Matt. 27:42

καταβήτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ πιστεύσομεν αὐτῷ (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 16)

Matt. 27:51-52

ἡ δὲ γῆ ἐτρόμασεν, αἱ πέτραι ἐσχίσθησαν, καὶ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη, καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἀνέστη (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 3)

καὶ τῆς γῆς τρεμούσης, καὶ τῶν πετρῶν σχιζομένων (*Ep. ad Maximum* 2)

Matt. 27:54

καὶ τῶν δημίων ἐπιγνόντων ὅτι ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱός ἐστιν ὁ σταυρωθείς (*Ep. ad Maximum* 2)

Matt. 27:59-60

καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ τοῦ κυρίου σῶμα εἰς μνημεῖον ἐτέθη, λίθος τε ἐπιτεθεὶς ἔκρυψεν αὐτὸ (*Vita Antonii* 90)

Matt. 28:5

(ἀφαιροῦσιν οἱ φαινόμενοι τὸν φόβον παρ᾽ αὐτὰ τῇ ἀγάπῃ ὡς ἐποίησε...) καὶ ὁ φανεὶς ἄγγελος ἐν τῷ θείῳ μνημείῳ ταῖς γυναιξὶ (*Vita Antonii* 36)

Matt. 28:19

πορευθέντες, μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.6)

πορευθέντες, μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.11)

πορευθέντες, μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.28)

πορευθέντες, μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.6)

πορευθέντες, μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.6)

βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*Ep. ad Serapion IV*.5)

References to the Gospel of Mark

Mark 1:24

σὺ εἶ (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ) καὶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 3)

σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 14)

Mark 1:31

χεῖρα γοῦν σωματικὴν ἐκτείνας ὁ λόγος ἤγειρε τὴν πυρέσσουσαν (*Ep. ad Afros* 7)

Mark 3:17

τούτου γὰρ ὑπηρέτας εἶναι θέλων τὸν Ἰακὼβ καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην, ἐκάλεσεν ὁ κύριος Βοανεργές, ὅ ἐστιν, υἱοὶ βροντῆς (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.10)

Mark 3:29

ὅς δ᾽ ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν (οὔτε ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι) (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.3)

(ὁ Μάρκος παρετηρήσατο λέγων·) ὃς δ᾽ ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἔνοχος ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτίας + (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 18)

Mark 3:30

+ ὅτι ἔλεγον, πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 18)

Mark 8:23

ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν σωματικῶς μὲν ὡς ἄνθρωπος πτύων (θεϊκῶς δὲ ὡς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνοίγων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλοῦ) (*Tomus ad Antiochenos* 7)

(ὁ δὲ ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλὸς), πτύσματι τῆς σαρκὸς τεθεράπευται παρὰ τοῦ λόγου (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 3)

Mark 9:18

τρίζων τοὺς ὀδόντας (*Vita Antonii* 6)

Mark 13:32

(φημὶ δὴ τὸ) περὶ τὴς ἡμέρας ἢ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.9)

περὶ δὲ τὴς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.9)

οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.9)

References to the Gospel of Luke

Luke 1:12-13

(ἀφαιροῦσιν οἱ φαινόμενοι τὸν φόβον παρ᾽ αὐτὰ τῇ ἀγάπῃ) ὡς ἐποίησε Γαβριὴλ τῷ Ζαχαρίᾳ (*Vita Antonii* 36)

Luke 1:28

(τοῦτο γὰρ πάλιν ὅμοιον ἐστι τοῦ λεγομένου παρὰ τοῦ Γαβριήλ) χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ (*Ep. ad Marcellinum* 6)

(καὶ πρὸ τούτου Γαβριηλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος τὸν παράδοχον τόκον εὐαγγελιζόμενος τῇ Μαρίᾳ) χαῖρε (φησῖ) κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ + (*Epistula ad Eupsychium*, PG 26,1248)

Luke 1:31

+ ἰδοὺ σὺ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχεις καὶ τέξῃ υἱὸν καὶ καλέσουσιν αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν + (*Epistula ad Eupsychium*, PG 26,1248)

Luke 1:32

+ οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται + (*Epistula ad Eupsychium*, PG 26,1248)

Luke 1:35

πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ· καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.11)

πνεῦμα ἅγιον [εἴρηκεν] ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ [εἰδὼς ὅτι ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἦν τὸ πνεῦμα· εὐθὺς γοῦν συνῆψε] καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.6)

Luke 1:41

καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης γενομένης φωνῆς παρὰ τῆς θεοτόκου Μαρίας ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει (*Vita Antonii* 37)

Luke 2:7

ὅτι βρέφος μὲν ἦν ἐπὶ φάτνης (*Ep. ad Maximum* 4)

Luke 2:10

(ἀφαιροῦσιν οἱ φαινόμενοι τὸν φόβον παρ᾽ αὐτὰ τῇ ἀγάπῃ ὡς ἐποίησε...) καὶ ὁ τοῖς ποιμέσι λέγων ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· μὴ φοβεῖσθε (*Vita Antonii* 36)

Luke 3:21-22

ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν, καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος, καὶ προσευχομένου, ἀνεωθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῷ εἴδει, ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν, ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.4)

Luke 4:1

Ἰησοῦς δὲ, πλήρης πνεύματος ὢν, ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.4)

Luke 4:41

(λέγοντας τοὺς δαίμονας ἀληθῆ γὰρ ἔλεγον) σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς θεοῦ (*Vita Antonii* 26)

Luke 6:36

γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, ὡς ὅ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστι (*Ep. ad Afros* 7)

Luke 8:28

δέομαι σου, μή με πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσῃς (*Ep. ad Marcellinum* 33)

Luke 9:61

τὸν διστάζοντα καὶ θέλοντα μὲν ἀκολουθῆσαι, ὑπερτιθέμενον δὲ καὶ συμβουλευόμενου διὰ τοῦς ἰδίους (*Ep. ad Dracontium* 4)

Luke 9:62

οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα ἐπ᾽ ἄροτρον καὶ στραφεὶς εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, εὔθετός ἐστιν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν (*Vita Antonii* 20)

Luke 10:17

οὕτως καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὑπετάσσετο τὰ δαιμόνια (*Ep. ad Marcellinum* 33)

Luke 10:18

ὁ διάβολος... ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς ἀστραπή (*Ep. ad Serapion I.26*)

ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα (*Vita Antonii* 40)

Luke 10:19

ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν ἐξουσίαν πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ (*Vita Antonii* 30)

ὡς σκορπίοι καὶ ὄφεις, εἰς τὸ καταπατεῖσθαι παρ᾽ ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν (*Vita Antonii* 24)

Luke 10:20

μὴ χαίρετε ὅτι τὰ δαιμόνια ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (*Vita Antonii* 38)

Luke 10:22

καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει, τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 5)

Luke 11:9

αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν (*Vita Antonii* 48)

Luke 11:19

εἰ ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσι; διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ ὑμῶν κριταὶ ἔσονται·+ (*In illud: + Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 20)

Luke 11:20

+ εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 20)

Luke 12:22

μὴ μεριμνήσητε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε (*Vita Antonii* 45)

Luke 12:29-31

καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε ἢ τί πίητε, καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε· ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητεῖ. ὑμῶν δὲ ὁ πατὴρ οἶδεν ὅτι χρῄζετε τούτων ἁπάντων. πλὴν ζητεῖτε πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν (*Vita Antonii* 45)

Luke 16:8

(τοῦτο μόνον) ὡς υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος ὄντες τούτου (φρονίμως πεποιήκασι) (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 18)

Luke 16:9

[...ἵνα μετὰ θάνατον] ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς [ὡς φίλους καὶ γνωρίμους] (*Vita Antonii* 91)

Luke 17:21

ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν (*Vita Antonii* 20)

Luke 18:2

κριτής τις ἦν ἔν τινι χώρᾳ, τὸν θεὸν μὴ φοβούμενος, καὶ ἄνθρωπον μὴ ἐντρεπόμενος (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.14)

Luke 19:42

εἰ ἔγνωτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ εἰς εἰρήνην (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 16)

Luke 21:8

βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ. Πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, λέγοντες· ἐγὼ εἰμι· καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικε, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσι· μὴ οὖν πορευθῆτε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 1)

Luke 22:7

τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων καὶ ἐν ᾗ ἔδει θύειν τὸ πάσχα (*Ep. ad Epiphanium*)

Luke 23:45

ὁ μὲν ἥλιος ἐσκοτίσθη (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 3)

συστείλαντος μὲν τοῦ ἡλίου τὰς ἀκτῖνας (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 2)

References to the Gospel of John

John 1:1

ἐν ἀρχῇ (μὲν γὰρ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ γέγονεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι) (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 2)

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 13)

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 16)

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Ep. ad Serapion I.*10)

ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ὁ λόγος, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Ep. ad Serapion II.*7)

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Ep. ad Serapion II.*7)

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 15)

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 23)

ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 8)

καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Ep. ad Marcellinum* 6)

John 1:3

πάντα γὰρ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 1)

(ἔπρεπε μὲν γὰρ τὴν μὲν ἀχὴν τῆς δημιουργίας) δι᾽ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι (εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὰ) (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 2)

(ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν) γὰρ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ γέγονεν (εἰς τὸ εἶναι) (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 2)

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 13)

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 15)

δι᾽ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα γέγονε, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 15)

καὶ πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδε ἕν (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.4)

δι᾽ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδε ἕν (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.8)

πάντα [γοῦν] δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδε ἕν (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.4)

πάντα διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδε ἕν (*Ep. ad Serapion IV*.3)

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Afros* 4)

εἰ γὰρ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα γεγονε (*Ep. ad Afros* 4)

πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Marcellinum* 6)

John 1:9

ἦν (γὰρ φησὶ) τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν, ὅ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.19)

John 1:12

ὅσοι γὰρ ἔλαβον αὐτὸν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.19)

John 1:14

γέγονεν ὁ λόγος σὰρξ (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 2)

ὁ λόγος γὰρ σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 9)

ὁ γὰρ λόγος (φησὶν ὁ Ἰωάννης) σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 17)

καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.7)

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 14)

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 15)

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 23)

αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Tomus ad Antiochenos* 7)

(καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι κατὰ τὸν ᾽Ιωάννην) ὁ λόγος σὰρχ ἐγένετο (*Subscriptio Paulini Antiocheni*, PG 26.809)

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 2)

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 3)

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 3)

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 2)

θεωροῦμεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρὸς, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 3)

γέγονε σὰρξ ὁ λόγος (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Marcellinum* 6)

John 1:45

ὅν γὰρ ἔγραψε Μωϋσῆς καὶ οἱ προφῆται, τοῦτον εὑρηκέναι (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 4)

John 3:16

οὕτω (γὰρ φησὶν) ὁ θεὸς ἠγάπησε τὸν κόσμον ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἀπέστειλεν (*Ep. ad Serapion I.*20)

John 3:17

ἦλθε γὰρ (ὡς ὁ ᾽Ιωάννης φησὶν) οὐχ ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι᾽ αὐτοῦ (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 1)

John 3:31

καὶ οὕτως ἠλέγχθησαν θεομάχοι καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀπὸ γῆς κενολογοῦντες (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.3)

John 3:35

ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 2)

John 4:14

τὸ ὕδωρ, ὅ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἁλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.23)

John 4:21, 23-24

πίστευέ μοι, γύναι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα... καὶ νῦν ἐστιν, ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσι τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ποιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν. πνεῦμα ὁ θεὸς, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.33)

John 4:26

αὐτὸς ὁ λαλῶν πάρειμι· (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.10)

John 5:17

(ἀλλὰ καὶ) ἐργαζομένου τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἕως ἄρτι (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 1)

ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 17)

John 5:19

ἅ γὰρ βλέπω [φησὶ] τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα, ταῦτα κἀγὼ ποιῶ (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.4)

ἅ βλέπω τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα, ταῦτα κἀγὼ ποιῶ (*Ep. ad Afros* 7)

John 5:22

καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ οὐδένα κρίνει, πᾶσαν δέ τὴν κρίσιν δέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 3)

John 5:25

ἀκούσονται γὰρ (φησὶ) τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ οἱ νεκροὶ, καὶ ζήσονται (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 5)

John 5:26

καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ζωὴν ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως ἔδωκε καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ζωὴν ἔξειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ (δέδωκε δὲ εἴρηκεν ἵνα τὸν διδόντα πατέρα δείξῃ) (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 4)

John 5:39

ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφὰς, ὅτι αὐταί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 4)

John 5:46

περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ (φησὶν) ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψε (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 4)

John 5:46-47

εἰ γὰρ ἐπίστευον τοῖς Μωϋσέως γράμμασιν, ἐπίστευσαν ἂν τοῖς κυρίου ῥήμασι. (περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ φησὶν ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψε) (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 4)

John 6:30

τί σὺ ποιεῖς περὶ σεαυτοῦ σημεῖον; (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 16)

John 6:38

ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρὸς (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1241)

ἵνα ποιῶ τό θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

John 6:45 (cf. Is 54:13)

(καὶ ἦν, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον) θεοδίδακτος (γενόμενος ὁ μακάριος) (*Vita Antonii* 66)

John 6:46

οὐχ ὅτι τὸν πατέρα τις ἑώρακεν εἰ μὴ ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 16)

John 6:61

τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει; + (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 19)

John 6:62

+ ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα, ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον; + (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 19)

John 6:63

+ τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν· ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν. τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν, πνεῦμα ἐστι καὶ ζωή (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 19)

ἃ γὰρ λελάληκα (φησὶν) ὑμῖν, πνεῦμα ἐστι καὶ ζωή (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 19)

John 7:13 (= Jn 19:38, 20:19; cf. Jn 9:22)

διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων (*Ep. ad Dracontium* 1)

John 7:15

πῶς οὗτος οἶδε γράμματα, μὴ μεμαθηκώς; (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 16)

John 7:39

τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, οὗ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς αὐτόν (*Ep. ad Serapion I.*23)

John 8:26

ἅ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, ταῦτα καὶ λαλῶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον (*Ep. ad Serapion I.*20)

John 8:40

τί με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι ἄνθρωπον ὅς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.7)

τί με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι ἄνθρωπον, ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα, ἣν ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 14)

τί ζηνεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι ἄνθρωπον, ὅς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 2)

John 8:42

εἰ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἦν, ἠγαπᾶτέ με ἄν· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ἥκω πρὸς ὑμᾶς (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 9)

John 8:44

ὡς ὁ πατήρ αὐτῶν διάβολος (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 4)

(ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Σωτὴρ) ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐστιν ὁ τῆς κακίας πατὴρ διάβολος (*Vita Antonii* 28)

κατὰ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν τὸν διάβολον (*Ep. ad Afros* 8)

John 8:56

οὕτως Ἀβραὰμ ἰδὼν τὸν κύριον ἠγαλλιάσατο (*Vita Antonii* 36)

John 8:57

πεντήκοντα ἔτη οὔπω ἔχεις, καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἑώρακας; (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 17)

John 8:58

διὸ οὔθ' ἕτερος μὲν ἦν ὁ πρὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἕτερος δὲ ὁ μετὰ Ἀβραάμ (*Tomus ad Antiochenos* 7)

John 9:6

ὁ δὲ ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλὸς, (πτύσματι τῆς σαρκὸς τεθεράπευται παρὰ τοῦ λόγου) (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 3)

John 9:32

ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσθη, ὅτι ἤνοιξέ τις ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλοῦ γεγεννημένου. + (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 18)

θεϊκῶς δὲ ὡς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνοίγων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλοῦ (*Tomus ad Antiochenos* 7)

John 9:33

+ εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 18)

John 10:15

καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατὴρ, κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 16)

John 10:16

καὶ γενομένης μιᾶς ποίμνης (*Tomus ad Antiochenos* 8)

John 10:21

ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα οὐκ ἔστι δαιμονιζομένου· μὴ δαιμόνιον δύναται τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνοίγειν; (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 18)

John 10:30

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 13)

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.2)

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.9)

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 14)

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Ep. ad Afros* 6)

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Ep. ad Afros* 7)

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Ep. ad Afros* 7)

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Ep. ad Afros* 8)

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Ep. ad Afros* 9)

ἐγω καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἓν ἐσμεν (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

John 10:33

διὰ τί σὺ, ἄνθρωπος ὢν, ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν θεόν (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 22)

διὰ τί συ, ἄνθρωπος ὢν, ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν θεόν; (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 3)

John 10:35

εἰ ἐκείνους εἶπεν θεοὺς, πρὸς οὕς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.4)

εἰ ἑκείνους θεοὺς εἶπε, πρὸς οὕς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο (*Ep. ad Afros* 7)

John 10:38

εἰ ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύετε, κἂν τοῖς ἔργοις μου πιστεύετε, ἵνα γνῶτε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 20)

John 11:34

(οὐδ' ἕτερος μὲν ἦν ὁ τὸν Λάζαρον ἐγείρας, ἕτερος δὲ ὁ πυνθανόμενος περὶ αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ' ὁ αὐτὸς ἦν ἀνθρωπίνως μὲν λέγων) ποῦ Λάζαρος κεῖται; (θεϊκῶς δὲ τοῦτον ἀνεγείρων) (*Tomus ad Antiochus* 7)

(πυνθάνεται γὰρ ἀνθρωπίνως) ποῦ Λάζαρος κεῖται (ἐγείρει δὲ τοῦτον θεϊκῶς) (*Ep. ad Maximum* 3)

John 11:43

καὶ φωνὴν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀφεὶς ἤγειρε τὸν Λάζαρον ἐκ νεκρῶν (*Ep. ad Afros* 7)

(πυνθάνεται γὰρ ἀνθρωπίνως ποῦ Λάζαρος κεῖται) ἐγείρει δὲ τοῦτον θεϊκῶς (*Ep. ad Maximum* 3)

John 12:27

νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1241)

καὶ τί εἴπω, πάτερ σωσόν με ἐκ της ὥρας ταύτης ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην + (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

τί εἴπω, πάτερ σωσόν με ἐκ της ὥρας (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

τί εἴπω (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

John 12:28

+ πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα καὶ ἀπόκρισις ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

John 12:35

ἐν σκότῳ διαπορεύονται (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.7)

John 13:12

τὸν μετὰ τὸ νίψαι τοὺς πόδας τῶν μαθητῶν λέγοντα + (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 2)

John 13:13

+ ὑμεῖς φώνεῖτέ με ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ καλῶς λέγετε, εἰμὶ γάρ. (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 2)

John 14:6

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.4)

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.33)

ἐγώ (γὰρ φησὶν) εἰμι ἡ ζωὴ (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.19)

ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ἡ ζωή (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 23)

John 14:9

ὁ γὰρ ἑωρακὼς τὸν υἱὸν ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 4)

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακῶς ἑώρακε τον πατέρα (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 13)

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.2)

ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.9)

ὁ ἑωρακῶς ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τον πατέρα (*Ep. ad Afros* 7)

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακῶς ἑώρακε τον πατέρα (*Ep. ad Afros* 8)

ὁ ἑωρακῶς ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τον πατέρα (*Ep. ad Afros* 9)

John 14:10

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ (*Ep. ad Episc. Aeg. et Lib.* 15)

ὁ πατὴρ (γὰρ φησὶν) ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοὶ, αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα. + (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.19)

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.31)

ὁ υἱὸς ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.2)

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστιν (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.4)

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.9)

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Ep. ad Serapion IV*.4)

John 14:11

+ πιστεύετέ μοι, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί. εἰ δὲ μὴ, διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτὰ πιστεύετέ μοι (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.19)

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 14)

John 14:16

(ὁ δὲ κύριος εἴρηκε πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ) παράκλητον (εἶναι τὸ πνεῦμα) (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.25)

John 14:17

(ὁ δὲ κύριος εἴρηκε) πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (καὶ παράκλητον εἶναι τὸ πνεῦμα (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.25)

ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.33)

John 14:23

ἐλευσόμεθα ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ μονὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.19)

ἐλευσόμεθα ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ μονὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.30)

ἐλευσόμεθα ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.31)

ἐλεύσεται ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ μονὴν ποιήσουσιν ἐν ἡμῖν (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.6)

John 14:26

ὁ παράκλητος τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.6)

τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (φησὶν ὁ υἱὸς) ὅ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.20)

τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (φησὶν ὁ υἱὸς) ὅ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου (*Ep. ad Serapion IV*.3)

John 15:26

ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.2)

ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος, ὅ (or ὃν) ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὅ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.6)

(οὐκ εἴρηκεν ἄγγελον ἀποστέλλειν, ἀλλὰ) τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὅ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.11)

πέμψω ὑμῖν τὸν παράκλητον, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὅ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.33)

ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος, ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὅ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.1)

[γέγραπται τὸ πνεῦμα εἶναι] πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀληθείας (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.25)

John 16:7

ἐὰν (γὰρ φησὶν) ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω, ἀποστελῶ τὸν παράκλητον (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.20)

John 16:12

ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω ὑμῖν λέγειν, ἀλλ᾽ οὔπω δύνασθε χωρεῖν + (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 11)

John 16:13

οὐ λαλήσει παρ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ ὁ παράκλητος ἀλλ᾽ ὅσα ἀκούσει, λαλήσει + (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.1)

John 16:13

+ ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, διδάξει ὑμᾶς (*In illud: Qui dixerit uerbum in filium* 11)

John 16:14

ἐκεῖνος [γὰρ φησὶν] ἐμὲ δοξάσει (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.20)

ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ γὰρ λήψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.20)

+ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.1)

εἰ ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ λήψεται τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ δίδοται [οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται] (*Ep. ad Serapion IV*.1)

John 16:15

πάντα, ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστι (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 3)

πάντα, ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστι (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 3)

οὐ γὰρ εἰρηκε, πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ δέδωκε μοι...ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἐμά ἐστιν (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 3)

πάντα, ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστιν (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 4)

(τὸ γὰρ) ὅσα ἔχει (τὴν δεσποτείαν κρατεῖν δείκνυσι τὸν πατέρα· τὸ δὲ) ἐμά ἐστιν (τὴν ἀχώριστον ἕνωσιν) (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 4)

ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 4)

(οὐ γὰρ εἴρηκεν ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πατὴρ, ἀλλ᾽) ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 4)

πάντα, ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστιν (*In Illud: Omnia Mihi Tradita Sunt* 5)

πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστι (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.2)

πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστιν (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.5)

πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστιν (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.1)

πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐστι (*Ep. ad Serapion IV*.3)

πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστιν (*Ep. ad Afros* 8)

John 16:23

ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ἐὰν τι αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, δώσει ὑμῖν (*Vita Antonii* 83)

John 16:24

αἰτεῖτε καὶ λήψεσθε (*Vita Antonii* 83)

John 16:30

νῦν οἴδαμεν ὅτι πάντα οἶδας (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.9)

John 17:4

πάτερ, ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.20)

John 17:10

καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα τοῦ πατρός ἐστιν (*Ep. ad Serapion II*.2)

τὰ ἐμὰ τοῦ πατρός ἐστιν (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.1)

John 17:21

οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι ἐν ἡμῖν ἓν ὦσιν (*Homilia in illud: Nunc anima mea turbata est*, PG 26,1244)

John 17:24

θέλω, ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ πάντοτε μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ὦσι (*Ep. ad Adelphium* 5)

John 18:38

(ὡς ὁ Πιλᾶτος λέγων μέν) οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εὑρίσκω εἰς αὐτόν (*Ep. ad Marcellinum* 27)

John 20:22

λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.6)

λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.11)

λάβετε γὰρ πνεῦμα ἅγιον (*Ep. ad Serapion I*.19)

καὶ ἐμφυσήσας δέδωκεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦτο τοῖς μαθηταῖς (*Ep. ad Serapion III*.1)

ἐμφυσήσας δέδωκεν αὐτὸ τοῖς μαθηταῖς (*Ep. ad Serapion IV*.2)

ὁ υἱὸς ἐμφυσῶν διδωσιν αὐτὸ τοῖς μαθηταῖς (*Ep. ad Serapion IV*.3)

John 20:28

αἰδείσθωσαν τὸν Θωμᾶν τὸν ψηλαφήσαντα τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, καὶ λέγοντα κύριον αὐτὸν εἶναι καὶ θεόν (*Ep. ad Maximum Philosophum* 2)

APPENDIX C

Gospel References from *Oratio iii contra Arianos*

The following references come from Athanasius' *Oratio iii contra Arianos*. They represent my reconstruction of Athanasius' biblical text based on Charles Kannegiesser's unpublished collations of the leading manuscripts of *Oratio iii*.[1] These references were not included in the statistical analysis due to Kannengiesser's arguments against the Athanasian authorship of *Oratio iii* (see Chapter 3). The references have been classified according to the categories of citation, adaptation, and allusion (see Chapter 3). I have also noted parallel passages, but the references have not been examined for possible conflations or harmonizations. It is my hope (at some point in the future) to analyze the textual character of the Gospel references in *Orationes iii-iv contra Arianos* and to compare them with the results of *Orationes i-ii*. This may provide information concerning the authorship and dating of these two writings.

==========

[1]Prof. Kannegiesser graciously provided me access to his collations. As stated in Chapter 3, the reconstructions reflect my own work and not necessarily the opinions of Prof. Kannengiesser.

References from the Gospel of Matthew

Matt. 1:23 (= Isa 7:14)

ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱὸν, καὶ καλέσουσι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουὴλ, ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 29) [C]

Matt. 3:17 (= Matt. 17:5)

οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 59) [C]

ὁ υἱός μου, καὶ μᾶλλον, ἐν ᾧ ἠὐδόκησα (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 65) [Ad]

Matt. 4:10 (cf. Mt 16:23)[2]

ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 40) [C]

Matt. 5:48

ἔσεσθε ὑμεῖς τέλειοι, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 19) [C]

Matt. 8:14-15 (= Mk 1:30-31, Lk 4:38-39)

ἀμέλει ὅτε χρεία γέγονε τὴν πενθερὰν τοῦ Πέτρου πυρέσσουσαν ἐγεῖραι, ἀνθρωπίνως μὲν ἐξέτεινε τὴν χεῖρα, θεϊκως δὲ ἦν παύων τὴν νόσον (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 32) [All]

Matt. 9:2 (= Mk 2:5, Lk 5:20; = Mt 9:5, Mk 2:9, Lk 5:23)

καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἠφίει, λέγων τῷ παραλυτικῷ (καὶ τῇ τοῦς πόδας ἀλειψάσῃ γυναικί·) ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 40) [All]

==========

[2]This citation comes from Mt 4:10 rather than Mt 16:23 because Athanasius refers to Jesus rebuking Satan (αυτος μεν γαρ επετιμα δι᾽ εαυτου τῳ Σατανᾳ).

Matt. 9:6 (= Mk 2:10, Lk 5:24)

ἵνα δὲ (φησὶν) εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 4) [C]

Matt. 10:16 (cf. Lk 10:3)

ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων· γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 18) [C]

Mt. 10:28 (= Lk. 12:4)

μὴ φοβεῖσθε τὸν ἀποκτείνοντα τὸ σῶμα (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 54) [Ad]

Matt. 11:27 (= Lk. 10:22)

πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸνπατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν θέλῃ ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 35) [C]

παρεδόθη μοι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 36) [C]

πάντα μοι παρεδόθη. (καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐξουσίαν πᾶσαν φησιν εἰληφέναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὶν εἴπῃ,) πάντα μοι παρεδόθη (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 39) [C]

οὐδεὶς γὰρ (φησὶ) γινώσκει τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 44) [C]

οὐδεὶς γὰρ οἶδε τὸν υἱὸν (φησὶν) εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν θέλῃ ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 46) [Ad]

Matt. 11:29

μάθετε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι πρᾶός εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 20) [Ad]

Matt. 12:40

καθὼς γὰρ ἦν Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 23) [C]

Matt. 13:13-14 (= Mk 4:12, Lk 8:10)

καὶ μὴ βλέποντες ἃ δεῖ βλέπειν, μηδὲ νοοῦντες ἃ ἀναγινώσκουσιν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 1) [All]

Matt. 16:13 (= Mk 8:27; cf. Lk 9:18)

ἐλθών εἰς μὲν τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου, ἐπυνθάνετο τῶν μαθητῶν, τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρώποι αὐτὸν εἶναι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [All]

καὶ ὅταν εἰς τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας ἐλθὼν πυνθάνεται, τίνα μελέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρώποι εἶναι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 37) [All]

Matt. 16:23 (= Mk. 8:33)

οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 57) [C]

Matt. 20:32

τί θέλετε ἵνα ποιήσω ὑμῖν; (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 37) [C]

Matt. 24:14

(εἰρηκὼς γὰρ οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς, διηγεῖται τοῖς μαθηταὶς τὰ πρὸ τὴς ἡμέρας, λέγων· τάδε ἔσται καὶ τάδε,) εἶτα τὸ τέλος (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 42) [All]

Mt. 24:36 (= Mk 13:32)

περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἢ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῆς ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἀγγελοι, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 42) [C]

οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 42) [C]

(οὐκ εἴρηκε γοῦν· οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ οἶδεν, ἵνα μὴ ἡ θεότης ἀγνοοῦσα φαίνηται, ἀλλ᾽ ἁπλῶς,) οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 43) [Ad]

(ὅτι περὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης αὐτοῦ λειτουργίας ἔλεγεν) οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς... (καὶ τούτου τεκμήριον ὅτι ἄνθρωπίνως εἰρηκὼς) οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς οἶδε (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 44) [Ad]

οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς οἶδε (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 45) [Ad]

οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 45) [Ad]

οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς οἶδεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 45) [Ad]

οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 46) [C]

οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 46) [C]

Mt. 24:39

(καὶ τὸ κατὰ Νῶε... καὶ γὰρ κἀκεῖ οὐκ εἶπεν· οὐκ ἔγνων, ἀλλ᾽·) οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, ἕως ἦλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμός (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 45) [C]

Matt. 24:42 (cf. Mk 13:35)

γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς, ποίᾳ ὥρᾳ ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 45) [C]

(ἔδει δὲ εἴπερ ἦν ἀγνοῶν θεϊκως εἰπεῖν, γρηγορεῖτε οὖν ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα καὶ ᾗ οὐ δοκῶ ὥρᾳ, νῦν δὲ τοῦτο μὲν οὐκ εἶπεν· εἰρηκὼς δὲ) ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε ὑμεῖς (καὶ ᾗ οὐ δοκεῖτε) (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 45) [Ad]

(ὁ πρὸ ὀλίγου λέγων· οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, νῦν οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι· ἐγὼ οὐκ οἶδα, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι·) ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 46) [Ad]

γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς, ποίᾳ ὥρᾳ ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 49) [C]

Matt. 24:44

ᾗ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὥρᾳ, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρώπου ἔρχεται (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 45) [C]

(ἔδει δὲ εἴπερ ἦν ἀγνοῶν θεϊκως εἰπεῖν, γρηγορεῖτε οὖν ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα καὶ ᾗ οὐ δοκῶ ὥρᾳ, νῦν δὲ τοῦτο μὲν οὐκ εἶπεν· εἰρηκὼς δὲ ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε ὑμεῖς καὶ) ᾗ οὐ δοκεῖτε (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 45) [Ad]

ᾗ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὥρᾳ, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρώπου ἔρχεται (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 49)

Matt. 25:13

(καὶ τὴν κατὰ τὰς παρθένους δὲ ὁμοίωσιν εἴρηκὼς... λέγων·) γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἡμέραν ἢ τὴν ὥραν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 46) [C]

Matt. 26:39

πάτερ, εἰ δυνατὸν, παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

εἰ δυνατὸν, παρελθέτω ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 34) [C]

εἰ δυνατὸν, παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 57) [Ad]

παρελθέτω τὸ ποτήριον (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 57) [C]

Matt. 26:41 (= Mk 14:38)

τὸ πνεῦμα πρόθυμον (ἔλεγεν) ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

Matt. 27:46 (= Mk 15:34)

θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες; (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

ἐλωΐ, ἐλωΐ λιμα σαβαχθανὶ, ὅ ἐστι, θεέ μου, θεέ μου, ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες; (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 54) [C]

ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες; (ὡς αὐτοῦ μέντοι πάλιν)... (ἰδοὺ γὰρ λέγοντος αὐτοῦ,) ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες; (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 56) [C]

ἵνα τί με ἐγκατέλιπες; (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 57) [C]

Matt. 27:52-53

καὶ τὰ μὲν μνήματα ἀνέῳγε, πολλὰ δὲ σώματα τῶν ἁγίων ἀνέστησαν, καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν τοῖς ἰδίοις (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 56)[All]

Matt. 27:54 (cf. Mt. 16:16)

ἀληθῶς υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐστιν οὗτος (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 52) [C]

Matt. 28:18

ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

ἐδόθη μοι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 36) [C]

ἐδόθη μοι ἐξουσία (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 38) [C]

References from the Gospel of Mark

Mark 6:38

πόσους ἀρτούς ἔχετε; (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους; (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 37) [C]

πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 37) [Ad][3]

Mark 10:18 (= Lk 18:19)

τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 7)

Mark 12:29

(ὅτε γοῦν μόνος λέγεται ὁ πατὴρ θεός καὶ ὅτι) εἷς θεός ἐστι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 6) [All]

ἄκουε Ἰσραὴλ, κύριος ὁ θεός σου κύριος εἷς ἐστι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 7) [C][4]

==========

[3]Athanasius possibly provides an incorrect source for this citation. He writes, "Thus John was aware that Christ when asking, 'How many loaves do you have?'was not ignorant, for he says..." (αμελει και ο Ἰωαννης επερωτωντα τον Χριστον...) and then gives a citation from Jn 6:6. He never mentions that the question comes from the Gospel of Mark.

[4]This is taken from Mk 12:29 rather than Dt 6:4 because Athanasius says that Jesus answered the "One who asked about the greatest commandment in the law" (αποκρινομενος δε τῳ ερωτωντι ποια εντολη εν τῳ νομῳ μειζων οτι...).

References from the Gospel of Luke

Luke 1:44

καὶ ᾽Ιωάννης ἔτι κυοφορούμενος ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει ἐπὶ τῇ φωνῇ τῆς θεοτόκου Μαρίας (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 33) [All]

Luke 2:52

καὶ ᾽Ιησοῦς προέκοπτε σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ χάριτι παρὰ θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

καὶ ᾽Ιησοῦς προέκοπτε σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ χάριτι παρὰ θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 51) [C][5]

καὶ ᾽Ιησοῦς γὰρ προέκοπτε σοφίᾳ καὶ χάριτι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 52) [Ad]

Luke 6:36 (cf. Mt 5:48)

γενόμενοι οἰκτίρμονες ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 10) [Ad]

γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς οἰκτίρμων ἐστί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 19) [C]

γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες ὡς ὁ πατὴρ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 19) [C]

καὶ οἰκτίρμονες ὡς ὁ πατὴρ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 20) [All]

Luke 7:48

(καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἠφίει, λέγων τῷ παραλυτικῷ καὶ τῇ τοῦς πόδας ἀλειψάσῃ γυναικί·) ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 40) [All]

Luke 10:18

ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν, πεσόντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 40) [C]

==========

[5]For this citation, Athanasius identifies his Gospel source: φησὶ τοίνυν ὁ Λουκᾶς.

Luke 10:17,19

τοῖς δὲ μαθηταῖς ἐδίδου κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ὅτε καὶ ὑποστρεψάντων αὐτῶν, (ἔλεγεν...) (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 40) [All]

Luke 13:16

καὶ ἅπερ ἔδησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς, ἔλυεν αὐτὸς, ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς ᾽Αβραμιαίας θυγατρὸς ἐποίησε (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 40) [All]

Luke 13:32

(καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ δὲ, τὸν μὲν ῾Ηρώδην δεικνὺς ὁποῖός ἐστιν, ἔλεγεν·) εἴπατε τῇ ἀλώτεκι ταύτῃ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 18) [C]

References from the Gospel of John

John 1:1

καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 4) [C]

θεὸς γὰρ ἐστιν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 16) [All]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος· + (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 29) [C]

ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 59) [C]

John 1:2

+ οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. + (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 29) [C]

John 1:3

+ πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 29) [C]

πάντα γὰρ δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 39) [C]

δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα γέγονε (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 44) [All]

John 1:12

ὅσοι γὰρ (φησὶν) ἔλαβον αὐτὸν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 19) [C]

John 1:14

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 29) [C]

ὁ λόγος γὰρ (φησὶ) σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 30) [C]

ὁ λόγος γὰρ (ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰωάννης) σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 30) [C]

ὁ γὰρ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 32) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 35) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 41) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 43) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 51) [C]

ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 55) [C]

John 2:4

οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 41) [C]

John 2:9

(οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου) καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον ἐποίει (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 41) [All]

John 2:25

(καὶ εἰδὼς τὰ ἐν τῇ ἑκάστου καρδίᾳ, καὶ) τί ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 37) [All]

John 3:17

ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οὐχ ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι᾽ αὐτοῦ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 29) [Ad]

John 3:35 (cf. Jn 5:20)

ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. + (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 35) [C]

John 3:36

+ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱον ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

John 5:17-18

εἶτα τῶν Ἰουδαίων ζητούντων ἀποκτεῖναι τὸν κύριον ὅτι πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ἐποίει, ἐργαζόμενος ἃ ἐργάζεται ὁ πατὴρ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 27) [All]

John 5:20

ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ ζωὴν αἰώνιον (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 66) [C]

John 5:22

ὁ πατὴρ οὐδένα κρίνει, ἄλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

John 5:23

ὁ ἐμὲ τιμῶν τιμᾷ τὸν πέμψαντά με (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 7) [Ad]

John 5:26

ὥσπερ ὁ πατὴρ ζωὴν ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως καὶ τῷ υἱῷ δέδωκε ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 36) [C]

John 5:30

οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ ποιεῖν ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδὲν ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἀκούω, κρίνω (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 35) [C]

John 5:37

ὁ πέμψας με πατὴρ, ἐκεῖνος μεμαρτύρηκε περὶ ἐμοῦ. οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ πώποτε ἀκηκόατε οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε· + (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 16) [C]

John 5:37-38

+ καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα, ὅτι ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος, τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 16) [C]

John 5:39

ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφὰς ὅτι αὐταί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 29) [C]

John 6:6 (cf. Mk 6:38)

(πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε οἶδε μὴ ἀγνοοῦντα, ἀλλὰ γινώσκοντα· φησὶ γὰρ·) τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε πειράζων τὸν Φίλιππον· αὐτὸς γὰρ ᾔδει, τί ἔμελλε ποιεῖν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 37) [Ad]

John 6:37

πᾶν ὃ δέδωκε μοι ὁ πατὴρ, πρὸς ἐμὲ ἥξει (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

John 6:38

ἐγὼ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα οὐχ ἵνα ποιήσω τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 7) [C]

ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 27) [C]

John 6:42

οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ; οὗ ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν ματέρα; (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 27) [C]

John 8:12 (= Jn 9:5)

ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 4)

John 8:44

οὐχ ὁρῶντες τὸ ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης οἰήσεως γενόμενον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν τοῦ διαβόλου πτῶμα (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 17) [All]

John 8:58

πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 27)

John 9:1,6,10

καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἐκ γενετῆς τυφλοῦ ἀνθρώπινον ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς, ἠφίει τὸ πτύσμα, θεϊκῶς δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἤνοιγε διὰ τοῦ πηλοῦ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 32) [All]

John 10:18

ἔλαβον (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 36)

ἐξουσίαν ἔχω θεῖναι τὴν ψυχήν μου· καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν (καὶ) οὐδεὶς αἴρει αὐτὴν ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 54) [Ad]

ἐξουσίαν ἔχω θεῖναι τὴν ψυχήν μου· καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 57) [Ad]

John 10:30

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 3) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 5) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 6) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 10) [C]

κἀγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 16) [C]

κἀγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 17) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 55) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 55) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 55) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 56) [C]

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 67) [C]

John 10:33

διὰ τί ὅλως, ἄνθρωπος ὢν ὁ Χριστὸς, θεὸν ἑαυτὸν ἐποίει; (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 27) [All]

πῶς ἄνθρωπος ὤν, δύναται θεὸς εἶναι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 27) [All]

διὰ τί συ, ἄνθρωπος ὤν, ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν θεόν; (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 30) [C]

John 10:38

ἵνα γνῶτε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 5) [Ad]

κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε (βλέποντες ἀνθρώπινον με περιβεβλημένον σῶμα ἀλλὰ κἂν) τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύσατε, ἵνα γνῶτε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 55) [Ad]

εἰ ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε (διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος περιβολὴν, κἂν) τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύσατε, ἵνα γνῶτε ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 67) [Ad]

John 11:14

(ὅρα πῶς ὁ κύριος ὁ πυνθανόμενος, ποῦ Λάζαρος κεῖται,) αὐτὸς εἶπε μὴ παρὼν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μακρὰν ὢν,) Λάζαρος ἀπέθανε καὶ ποῦ ἀπέθανε (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 37) [All]

John 11:34

εἰς δὲ τὴν Βηθανίαν παραγενόμενος ἠρώτα ποῦ Λάζαρος κεῖται (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [All]

ἐὰν ἀκούσωμεν ἐπερωτῶντος αὐτοῦ, ποῦ Λάζαρος κεῖται (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 37) [All]

ὅρα πῶς ὁ κύριος ὁ πυνθανόμενος, ποῦ Λάζαρος κεῖται, (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 37) [All]

John 11:43 (cf. Jn 12:1)

ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ λαζάρου φωνὴν μὲν ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἀνθρωπίνην ἠφίει· θεϊκῶς δὲ ὡς θεὸς τὸν λάζαρον ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 32) [All]

John 12:27

νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται· καὶ τί εἴπω; πάτερ, σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης; ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην. + (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται· (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 54) [C]

νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται· (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 57) [C]

John 12:27-28

+ πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα. ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· καὶ ἐδόξασα, καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26)

John 13:21

ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐμαρτυρήσε καὶ εἶπεν· αμὴν, αμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

John 14:6

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 9) [C]

ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀλήθεια (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 19) [C]

John 14:9

ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 5) [C]

ὁ ἑωρακὼς τὸν υἱὸν ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 5) [Ad]

ὁ ἐμὲ ἑωρακὼς ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 16) [C]

ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ, ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 67) [C]

John 14:10 (= Jn 14:11)

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 1) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 1) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 2) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 2) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 3) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 3) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 3) [C]

ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 5) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 6) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 6) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 10) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 16) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 17) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 37) [C]

(οὐκ ἀληθεύει λέγων ὁ υἱὸς·) ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ... (καὶ οὐκ ἔπρεπε λέγειν αὐτὸν·) ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ. (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 64) [Ad]

ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 67) [C]

John 14:23

ἐλευσόμεθα ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ, καὶ μονὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 11) [Ad]

John 14:28

ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μού ἐστι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 7) [C]

John 16:15

πάντα γὰρ (φησὶν αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς) ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 4) [C]

πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 35) [C]

πάντα τὰ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐστι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 44) [All]

John 17:1

δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱὸν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 38) [C]

πάτερ, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα· δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱὸν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 43) [C]

John 17:3

καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 9) [C]

John 17:5

δόξασόν με σὺ, πάτερ, τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 26) [C]

δόξασόν με (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 38) [C]

τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 39) [C]

John 17:10

τὰ ἐμὰ σά ἐστιν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 4) [Ad]

τὰ ἐμὰ τοῦ πατρός ἐστιν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 35) [Ad]

John 17:11

πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 17) [C]

John 17:17

ἁγίασον αὐτούς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου. ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 19) [C]

John 17:20

οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ· + (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 17) [C]

John 17:21

+ ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσι, καθὼς σὺ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ, κἀγὼ ἐν σοὶ, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοῖ ἐν ἡμῖν ἓν ὦσιν· ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας. + (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 17) [C]

ἵνα καὶ αὐτοῖ ἐν ἡμῖν ἓν ὦσιν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 20) [C]

καθὼς σὺ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ, κἀγὼ ἐν σοὶ, ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 22) [Ad]

καθὼς σὺ ἐν ἐμοὶ, κἀγὼ ἐν σοὶ (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 23) [C]

καθὼς σὺ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ, κἀγὼ ἐν σοὶ, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἓν ὦσιν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 25) [C]

John 17:22

+ κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν, ἣν δέδωκάς μοι, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν, καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἕν ἐσμεν, + (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 17) [C]

ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν, καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 17) [C]

ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν, καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 20) [C]

ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν, καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 20) [C]

κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν, καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἕν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 21) [C]

John 17:23

+ ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα ὦσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν, καὶ ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας. (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 17) [C]

ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἵνα ὦσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 22) [C]

ὅταν δὲ (φησὶν) οὗτοι τελειωθῶσιν οὕτω, τότε γινώσκει ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 23) [Ad]

John 18:5

(ἀλλὰ καὶ ζητούμενος ἔλεγεν·) ἐγώ εἰμι (*Oratio iii contra Arianos* 54) [C]

APPENDIX D

Gospel References in Greek Catenae

The following collection represents Gospel references attributed to Athanasius found in catenae. The source for this material is Migne's *Patrologiae Graeca*, vols 26-27.

Volume 26:

Scholia in Pauli epistulas (no references to the Gospels)	26,1217-1221
Scholia in Actus (no references to the Gospels)	26,1316-1317

Volume 27:

Fragmenta in catenis	
Scholia in Job	27,1344-1348
Scholia in Canticum canticorum	27,1348-1349
Scholia in Matthaeum	27,1364-1389
Scholia in Lucam	27,1392-1404
Scholia spuria in ii Corinth	27,1404-1408

References to the Gospel of Matthew

Matt. 1:17

καὶ πῶς ἐνταῦθα ἐπὶ τῶν γενεῶν... δεκατέσσαρες γενεαὶ εὑρίσκονται (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1364)

Matt. 2:2

εἴδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1364)

ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1365)

Matt. 2:20

ἐγερθεὶς παραλάβε τὸ παιδίον (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1365)

Matt. 3:4

ἡ δὲ τροφὴ ἦν ἀκρίδες καὶ μέλι ἄγριον (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1365)

Matt. 3:11

αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1365)

Matt. 3:17 (= Mt 17:5)

οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1397-1400)

Matt. 4:3 (= Luke 4:3)

εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1368)

εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1368)

εἰ υἱὸς εἶ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1368)

Matt. 4:23

διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1368)

Matt. 5:6

μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην. πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην (λέγει...) χορτασθήσονται (γὰρ φησὶ...) (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1368)

Matt. 5:8

μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ θεὸν ὄψονται (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1368)

Matt. 5:22

πῶς ὁ λέγων τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, μωρὲ, ἔνοχος ἐσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός; (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1384) [Ad]

εἰ γὰρ ὁ λέγων τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, μωρὲ, ἔνοχος ἐστιν εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός; (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385) [Ad]

Matt. 5:28

ὁ ἐμβλέψας γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1369)

ἀμέλει τοσοῦτον ἡμᾶς εἶναι βούλεται σώφρονας, ὡς μηδὲ μέχρις ἐπιθυμίας ἐμβλέπειν γυναικί (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1396) [All]

ὁ γὰρ ἐμβλέψας (φησὶ) πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι, ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1396)

Matt. 5:29

εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε αὐτὸν, καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1369)

Matt. 6:1

προσέχετε δὲ τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῷ ἐκ [sic] τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1369)

Matt. 6:3

σοῦ δὲ ποιοῦντες ἐλεημοσύνην, μὴ γνώτω (φησιν) ἡ ἀριστερὰ χεὶρ τί ποιεῖ ἡ δεξιά (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1372)

Matt. 6:7

προσευχόμενοι δὲ μὴ βαττολογήσητε (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1372)

Matt. 6:8

οἶδεν ὁ θεὸς ὧν χρείαν ἔχετε πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αἰτῆσαι αὐτόν (*Scholia in Canticum canticorum*, PG 27.1357)

Matt. 6:19

περὶ τοῦ μὴ θησαυρίζειν ἐπὶ γῆς (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1373)

μὴ θησαυρίζητε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (φησίν ὁ Χριστὸς) ὅπου σῆς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται διορύσσουσι καὶ κλέπτουσι + (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1373)

Matt. 6:20

+ θησαυρίζετε δὲ ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις οὐκ ἀρανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν, οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1373)

Matt. 6:22

ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός σου ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου. εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σοῦ ἁπλοῦς ἐστιν, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινὸν ἔσται + (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1373)

Matt. 6:23

+ ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρός ἐστιν, ὅλον τὸ σῶμα σου σκοτεινὸν ἔσται (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1373)

Matt. 6:25

οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλείον ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος; (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1373)

διαφέρει δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς τροφῆς... τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1373)

μὴ μεριμνήσητε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε, ἢ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε· ἐπὶ πλείον ἐστι ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1376)

ἐπὶ πλειόν ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1376)

Matt. 6:33

ζητεῖτε πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1372)

ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1376)

Matt. 7:1

μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε· + (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1376)

μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1376)

μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1377)

μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1388)

Matt. 7:2

+ ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε, κριθήσεσθε· καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1376)

Matt. 7:3

τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφας τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου οὐ κατανοεῖς; + (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1377)

Matt. 7:4

+ ἢ πῶς λέγεις τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· + (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1377)

Matt. 7:5

+ ὑποκριτὰ, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου τὴν δοκὸν, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1377)

Matt. 7:6

μὴ δότε τὰ ἅγια ταῖς κυσὶ, μηδὲ βάλετε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1380)

μὴ δότε τὰ ἅγια τοῖς κυσὶ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1380)

μὴ βάλωμεν οὖν τοὺς μαργαρίτας ἡμῶν τῶν ἀχράτων μυτηρίων ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοιροτρόπων ἀνθρώπων (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1380)

μὴ δότε οὖν τὰ ἅγια τοῖς κυσὶ, μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε καταπατήσωσιν αὐτοὺς τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν (τοῖς ἀλογίστιος λογισμοῖς) καὶ στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν ὑμᾶς (ποιήσανσες σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις) (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1380)

Matt. 7:15

προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύρατι προβάτου, ἔνδοθεν δέ εἰσι λύκοι ἅρπαγες + (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1380)

Matt. 7:16

+ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1381)

Matt 8:3

καθαρίσθητι καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.565)

Matt 8:29

ἦλθες ὧδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ὑμᾶς (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.577)

Matt. 9:28

πιστεύεις ὅτι δύναμαί σοι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

Matt 10:35

(ἐκίνησε κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου φωνὴν χωρίζον) ᾳύμφην ἐκ πενθερᾶς καὶ πατέρα ἐξ υἱοῦ (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.577)

Matt. 10:38

ὃς οὐκ αἴρει τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ μοι, οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξεος (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1381)

Matt. 11:19

καὶ φάγον αὐτὸν καὶ οἰνοπότην (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385) [All]

Matt. 11:29

ἄρατε τὸν ζυγόν μου ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς, καὶ μάθετε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ ὅτι πρᾶός εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ εὑρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν + (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1381)

μάθετε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ ὅτι πρᾶός εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1396)

Matt. 11:30

+ ὁ γὰρ ζογός μου χρηστὸς, καὶ τὸ φορτίον μου ἐλαφρόν ἐστιν (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1381)

ὁ ζυγός (τοίνυν τοῦ σωτῆρος) χρηστὸς καὶ τὸ φορτίον ἐλαφρόν (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1381)

ὁ ζυγός μου χρηστὸς ἐστι (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.549)

Matt. 12:31

διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτοῖς + (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1384)

καὶ πάλιν ἐὰν πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1384)

πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀφεθήσεται· + (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385)

Matt. 12:32 (in combination with Mark 3:29; cf. Luke 12:10b)

+ καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρωποῦ, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ᾽ ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1384)

ἐὰν γὰρ ὃς εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1384-1385)

ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385)

\+ ὃς δ᾽ ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρωποῦ, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ᾽ ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385)

ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (ἤγουν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ) ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385)

οὐκ ἀφίενται οὔτε ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385)

Matt. 12:36

πῶς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀργοῦ λόγου ἀπολογίαν δώσομεν; (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1384) [Ad]

Matt. 16:19

καὶ ὁ Πέτρος, λαβὼν τὰς κλεῖς τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1377)

Matt. 16:23

(Σατᾶν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος προηγόρευσε λέγων) ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατᾶν (*Scholia spuria in ii Corinth*, PG 27.1408)

Matt. 17:15

κύριε, ἐλέησόν μου τὸν υἱὸν, ὅτι σεληνιάζεται καὶ κακῶς πάσχει (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1388)

Matt. 18:3

ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1368)

ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1396)

Matt. 19:12

εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν (*Scholia in Canticum canticorum*, PG 27.1352)

Matt 21:43

(οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι) ὅτι αρθήσεται ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.549)

Matt. 23:13

ὅτι κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1389)

οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι ὅτι) αρθήσεται ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ) (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.549)

Matt. 23:24

ἦσαν δὲ καὶ κώνωπα διυλίζοντες καὶ τὴν κάμηλον καταπίνοντες (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1377)

Matt 25:41

πορεύεσθε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ οἱ κατηραμένοι (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.549)

Matt. 26:31 (= Zach. 13:7)

πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης (*Scholia in Canticum canticorum*, PG 27.1353)

πάντες ὑμεῖς (φησί) σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταῦτῃ (*Scholia in Job* 9.6 - J.B. Pitra, Analecta Sacra et Classica Spicilegio Solesmensi, p 24, lines 8-10)

References to the Gospel of Mark

Mark 9:22(?)

(καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ σεληνιαζομένου δὲ φησιν) ἐὰν πιστεύῃς, γίνεται (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

Mark 14:37

οὕτως οὐκ ἰσχύσατε μίαν ὥραν γρηγορῆσαι; (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1397)

References to the Gospel of Luke

Luke 1:20

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔσῃ σιωπῶν, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι, ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας γένηται ταῦτα· ἀνθ᾽ ὧν οὐκ ἐπιστευσας τοῖς λόγοις μου, οἵτινες πληρωθήσονται εἰς τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῶν (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1392)

Luke 1:28

χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.565)

Luke 1:35

διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἐκ σοῦ ἅγιον, κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1392)

(οὐκ ἁπλῶς δὲ) τὸ γεννώμενον (ἵνα μὴ ἔξωθεν ἐπεισαγόμενον αὐτῇ σῶμα νομισθῇ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπήγαγεν καὶ τὸ) ἐκ σοῦ (ἵνα ἐξ αὐτῆς φύσει τὸ γεννώμενονεἶναι πιστευθῇ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1392)

Luke 1:36

καὶ ἰδοῦ ᾽Ελισάβετ ἡ συγγενής σου (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1392)

Luke 1:38

ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου, γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1392)

Luke 1:46

μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1392)

μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1393)

Luke 1:48

ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ· ιδοὺ γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσί με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1393)

ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσί με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1393)

Luke 2:22

καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰερουσόλυμα παραστῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ + (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1393)

παραστῆσαι αὐτὸν τῷ κυρίῳ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1396)

παραστῆσαι αὐτὸν τῷ κυρίῳ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1396)

Luke 2:23

+ καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ πληθήσεται + (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1393)

ὅτι πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1397)

Luke 2:24

+ καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι θυσίαν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου, ζεῦγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νεοσσοὺς περιστερῶν (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1393)

Luke 2:29

νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, κύριε, κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1397)

νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1397)

Luke 4:33

καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου καὶ ἀνέκραξε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων + (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1397)

Luke 4:34

+ ἔα τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοὶ, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδαμέν σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1397)

οἴδαμέν σε (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1397)

σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1397)

σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

οἴδαμέν σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

Luke 7:14

Νεανίσκε σοὶ λέγω ἐγέρθητι καὶ εὐθέως ἠγέρθη (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.565)

Luke 8:50

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀκούσας ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ λέγων· μὴ φοβοῦ· μόνον πίστευε καὶ σωθήσεται (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

μόνον πίστευε καὶ σωθήσεται (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

Luke 9:57

ἐγένετο δὲ πορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, εἶπέ τίς πρὸς αὐτόν· ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἂν ἀπέρχῃ κύριε + (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1401)

ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ ἀκολουθήσω σοι (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1401)

Luke 9:58

+ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1401)

Luke 10:18

ὁ δὲ διάβολος... ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὡς ἀστραπή (*Scholia in Job - Nicetae Heracleotae Catena* in Job, PG 27.1348)

Luke 10:19

ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.567)

Luke 11:15

ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἄρξοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385)

Luke 11:27

μακαρία ἡ κοιλία ἡ βαστάσασά σε καὶ μαστοὶ οὓς ἐθήλασας (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1393)

Luke 11:46

καὶ τοῖς νομικοῖς οὐαὶ (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.549)

Luke 11:52

(ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς λέγει) ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1389)

Luke 12:9

ὁ ἀπαρνησάμενος αὐτὸν [ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων] ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1384)

Luke 13:20

τίνι ὁμοιώσω τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; + (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1401)

Luke 13:21

+ ὁμοία ἐστι ζύμῃ, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη ὅλον (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1401)

Luke 14:26

ἐὰν μή τις μισῇ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1381)

Luke 14:33

ὃς οὐκ ἀποτάσσεται πᾶσιν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν οὐ δύναταί μου εἶναι μαθητής (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1381,1384)

Luke 16:25

ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου, νῦν δὲ ὧδε ὀδυνᾶσθαι (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1397)

Luke 19:43

ὅταν ἴδετε τὴν Ἰερουσαλὴμ κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.560)

References to the Gospel of John

John 1:14

ὁ γὰρ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385)

καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.580)

John 4:24

πνεῦμα ὁ θεός (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385)

John 5:14

ὑγιὴς γέγονας, μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε (*Scholia in Lucam*, PG 27.1400)

John 5:20 (?)

ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ποιῶ οὐδέν (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.565)

John 5:20

(ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ποιῶ οὐδέν καὶ πάλιν) ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos,* PG 27.565)

John 5:23

ὁ μὴ τιμῶν τὸν υἱὸν οὐ τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα (*Scholia in Matthaeum,* PG 27.1384)

ὁ γὰρ μὴ τιμῶν τὸν υἱὸν οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τιμᾷ (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos,* PG 27.549)

John 5:46

εἰ ἐπιστεύετε Μωσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἐν ἐμοί (*Scholia in Job* 9.5 - J.B. Pitra, Analecta Sacra et Classica Spicilegio Solesmensi, p 23, lines 13-14)

John 6:33 (cf. Jn 6:58)

ὅς ἐστιν ἄρτος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβὰς καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ(*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos,* PG 27.580)

John 6:39

βούλημα δὲ φησὶν αὐτὸς τοῦ πατρὸς) ἵνα πᾶν δέδωκέ μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos,* PG 27.565)

John 6:54

ὁ μὴ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ μὴ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον (*Scholia in Matthaeum,* PG 27.1385)

John 10:9

ἐγὼ εἰμι (ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ) ἡ θύρα (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos,* PG 27.572)

John 10:30

ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν (*Scholia in Matthaeum,* PG 27.1384)

John 13:31

νῦν (γὰρ φησὶν) ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (*Scholia in Matthaeum*, PG 27.1385)

John 14:2

πολλαὶ μοναὶ παρὰ τῷ πατρί (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.576)

John 14:6

ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς (καὶ ἡ θύρα) (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.572)

John 19:37

ὅταν ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν (*Fragmenta Comment in Psalmos*, PG 27.549)

John 20:17

(ἀμέλει γε ὅτε ἀνέστη ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ ἦλθων αἱ γυναῖκες ἅψασθαι αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν αὐταῖς) μή μου ἅπτεσθε· οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μοῦ (*Scholia in Canticum canticorum*, PG 27.1356)

APPENDIX E

Athanasius in the Apparatus of NA[27] and UBS[4]

The following lists indicate places in which Athanasius' witness may be included in the critical apparatus of NA[27] and UBS[4]. Only those places where the editions already provide an apparatus are considered. Athanasius' reading is given followed by either the designation *txt* (indicating agreement with the reading given in the text of the edition) or *v.l.* (indicating agreement with one of the variant readings). There are no places in the Gospels where the apparatus incorrectly cite the testimony of Athanasius.

Athanasius in the Apparatus of NA[27]

Matt	1:23	καλεσουσιν (*txt*)
Matt	2:23	Ναζαρετ (*txt*)
Matt	4:10	οπισω μου (*v.l.*)
Matt	6:7	εθνικοι (*txt*)
Matt	6:25	omit η τι πιητε (*v.l.*)
Matt	6:26	εις τας αποθηκας (*v.l.*)
Matt	6:28	αυξανουσιν ου κοπιωσιν ουδε νηθουσιν (*txt*)
Matt	8:29	υιε (του) θεου (*txt*)
Matt	9:36	εσκυλμενοι (*txt*)
Matt	10:18	ηγεμονας δε και βασιλεας αχθησεσθε (*txt*)

Matt 10:23 ετεραν (*txt*)

Matt 11:28 πεφορτισμενοι (*txt*)

Matt 12:14 οι δε φαρισαιοι εξελθοντες (*v.l.*)

Matt 12:24 Βεελζεβουλ (*txt*)

Matt 13:13 βλεποντες ου βλεπουσιν (*txt*)[1]

Matt 13:25 επεσπειρεν (*txt*)

Matt 14:12 σωμα (*v.l.*)

Matt 14:13 εν πλοιω (*txt*)

Matt 15:11 ου το (*txt*)

Matt 15:11 κοινοι (*txt*)

Matt 18:6 εις τραχηλον (*v.l.*)

Matt 18:20 εκει (*txt*)

Matt 19:4 κτισας (*txt*)

Matt 19:5 προσκολληθησεται (*v.l.*)

Matt 19:6 συνεζευξεν ανθρωπος (*txt*)

Matt 22:30 γαμιζονται (*txt*)

Matt 22:30 αγγελοι (*txt*)

Matt 24:15 εστος εν τοπω αγιω (*txt*)

Matt 24:16 εις (*txt*)

Matt 24:17 καταβητω (*txt*; see apparatus for $\aleph^{c}$)

Matt 24:17 τα (*txt*)

Matt 24:18 τα ιματια (*v.l.*)

Matt 26:45 το (*txt*)

---

[1]Athanasius does not cite the second portion of this variant.

Matt 26:45 ιδου γαρ ηγγικεν (*v.l.*)

Matt 28:19 πορευθεντες μαθητευσατε (*v.l.*)

Matt 28:19 βαπτιζοντες (*txt*)

Luke 1:27 μεμνηστευμενην (*v.l.*)

Luke 1:35 γεννωμενον εκ σου (*v.l.*)

Luke 2:28 αγκαλας και (*txt*)

Luke 8:52 ου γαρ (*txt*)

Luke 10:18 ως αστραπην πεσοντα εκ του ουρανου (*v.l.*)

Luke 11:15 Βεελζεβουλ (*txt*)

Luke 17:2 των μικρων τουτων ενα (*txt*)

Luke 21:8 λεγοντες οτι (*v.l.*)

Luke 21:8 μη πορευθητε (*txt*)

Luke 22:28 υμεις δε εστε (*txt*)

Luke 22:29 υμιν καθως (*txt*)

Luke 22:29 βασιλειαν (*txt*)

Luke 23:45 και εσκοτισθη ο ηλιος or εσκοτισθη δε ο ηλιος (*v.l.*)

Luke 24:1 αρωματα (*txt*)

Luke 24:39 μου[2] (*txt*)

Luke 24:39 εγω ειμι αυτος (*txt*)

Luke 24:39 με (*txt*)

Luke 24:39 σαρκα και οστεα ουκ εχει (*txt*)

Luke 24:40 και - ποδας (*txt*)

Luke 24:40 επεδειξεν (*v.l.*)

John 1:3 ουδε εν (*txt*)

John 1:13 οι ουκ (*txt*)

John 1:13 ουδε εκ θεληματος ανδρος (*txt*)

John 1:13 εγεννηθησαν (*txt*)

John 1:17 η χαρις (*txt*)

John 1:18 ο μονογενης υιος (*v.l.*)

John 3:17 υιον αυτου (*v.l*)

John 5:18 ουν (*txt*)

John 5:19 ομοιως ποιει (*txt*)

John 5:36 δεδωκεν (*txt*)

John 5:36 ταυτα (*v.l.*)

John 6:38 εκ (*v.l.*)

John 6:38 ποιω Ath^{pt} (*txt*) / ποιησω Ath^{pt} (*v.l.*)

John 6:38 με (without final πατρος) (*txt*)

John 6:39 τουτο - με (*txt*)

John 6:39 πεμψαντος με (i.e., omit πατρος)

John 6:39 δεδωκεν (*txt*)

John 6:39 εξ αυτου (*txt*)

John 6:39 αυτο (*txt*)

John 6:39 εν (*txt*)

John 6:40 τουτο - θελημα (*txt*)

John 6:40 εγω (*txt*)

John 6:40 εν (*txt*)

John 6:46 του θεου (*txt*)

John 6:46 $πατερα^{2}$ (*txt*)

John 7:30 (οι δε) εζητουν (*v.l.*)

John 7:30 επεβαλεν (*txt*)

John 7:30 ουπω (*txt*)

John 8:35 ο υιος - αιωνα (*txt*)

John 8:35 ο δε υιος (*v.l.*)

John 8:36 ουν (*txt*)

John 8:36 εσεσθε (*txt*)

John 8:42 εγω γαρ εκ του (θεου) εξηλθον (*txt*)

John 8:44 του πατρος (*txt*)

John 8:58 γενεσθαι (*txt*)

John 8:59 δε (*txt*)

John 8:59 και διελθων δια μεσου αυτων επορευετο και παρηγεν ουτως (*v.l.*)

John 9:33 ουτος παρα θεου (*txt*)

John 9:39 εις τον κοσμον τουτον εληλυθα (*v.l.*)

John 10:30 πατηρ εν (*txt*)

John 10:33 σεαυτον θεον (*txt*)

John 10:35 προς - εγενετο (*txt*)

John 10:35 του θεου εγενετο (*txt*)

John 10:35 η γραθη (*txt*)

John 10:36 ειπον υιος (*txt*)

John 10:36 του θεου (*txt*)

John 10:38 πιστευητε (*txt*)

John 10:38 πιστυετε Ath^{pt} (*txt*)/πιστευσατε Ath^{pt} (*v.l.*)

John 10:38 και γινωσκητε (*txt*)

John 10:38 τω πατρι (*txt*)

John 11:47 πολλα ποιει σημεια (*txt*)

John 11:53 εβουλευσαντο (*txt*)

John 11:54 ο ουν ᾽Ιησους (*txt*)

John 11:54 εκειθεν (*txt*)

John 11:54 χωραν εγγυς (*txt*)

John 12:32 οταν (*v.l.*)

John 12:32 παντας (*txt*)

John 12:34 συ λεγεις (*v.l.*)

John 12:34 οτι^{2} (*txt*)

John 12:46 πας (*txt*)

John 14:9 εωρακεν τον (*txt*)

John 14:10 πατηρ ο εν (*v.l.*)

John 14:10 αυτος (*v.l.*)

John 14:23 ελευσομεθα (*txt*)

John 14:23 ποιησομεν (*v.l.*)

John 14:28 ηγαπατε (*txt*)

John 14:28 οτι ειπον (*v.l.*)

John 14:28 πατηρ μειζων (*txt*)

John 14:30 ευρισκει ουδεν (*v.l.*)

John 16:13 οσα ακουσει (*txt*)

John 16:13 ακουσει (*txt*)

John 16:15 include verse (*txt*)

John 16:25 υμιν αλλ(α) (*v.l.*)

John 17:3 γινωσκωσιν (*txt*)

John 17:3 απεστειλας (*txt*)

John 17:4 το εργον ετελειωσα (*v.l.*)

John 17:5 πατερ (*txt*)

John 17:5 η (*txt*)

John 17:5 προ του τον κοσμον ειναι παρα σοι (*txt*)

John 17:10 τα εμα παντα σα εστιν και τα σα εμα (*txt*)

John 17:18 καγω - κοσμον (*txt*)

John 17:18 απεστειλα (*txt*)

John 17:19 εγω (*txt*)

John 17:19 ωσιν και αυτοι (*txt*)

John 17:21 εν ωσιν (*v.l.*)

John 17:22 δεδωκας (*txt*)

John 17:22 δεδωκα (*txt*)

John 17:22 εν εσμεν (*v.l.*)

John 18:5 Ναζωραιον (*txt*)

John 18:5 λεγει αυτοις εγω (*txt*)

John 18:5 εγω ειμι (without Ἰησους) (*txt*)

John 19:39 φερων (*txt*)

John 19:39 μιγμα (*txt*)

John 20:25 τους τυπους (*v.l.*)

Athanasius in the Apparatus of UBS[4]

Matt 4:10	Apparatus correct
Matt 6:25	Apparatus correct
Matt 6:28	Apparatus correct
Matt 10:23	Apparatus correct (ετεραν)
Matt 11:27	Apparatus correct
Matt 13:13	οτι βλεποντες ου βλεπουσιν (*txt*)[2]
Matt 19:4	Apparatus correct
Matt 22:30	αγγελοι (*txt*)
Luke 1:35	γεννωμενον εκ σου (*v.l*)[3]
Luke 23:45	και εσκοτισθη ο ηλιος (*v.l.*)
Luke 24:40	Apparatus correct
John 1:3	Apparatus correct
John 1:13	Apparatus correct (οι ουκ... εγγενηθησαν)
John 1:13	Apparatus correct (ουδε εκ θεληματος ανδρος)
John 1:18	Apparatus correct
John 8:59	Apparatus correct
John 10:38	Apparatus correct
John 12:32	Apparatus correct
John 17:21	Apparatus correct
John 18:5	εγω ειμι (*txt*)
John 19:39	Apparatus correct

==========

[2]Athanasius does not cite the second portion of this variant.

[3]Athanasius was listed as supporting this reading in the critical apparatus of UBS[3], but for some reason his name is omitted in the apparatus of UBS[4].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM

I A. Biblical Manuscripts, Collations, and Editions Used for Collating Athanasius' Text

Aland, Kurt, ed. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, 10th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelanstalt, 1978.

Aland, Kurt; Black Matthew; Martini, Carlo M.; Metzger, Bruce M.; and Wikgren, Allen, eds. The Greek New Testament, 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1993. (UBS^4)

Beerman, Gustav, and Caspar René Gregory, eds. Die Koridethi Evangelien. Leipzig: J.C Hinrichs, 1913. (Gregory Θ)

Champlin, Russell. Family E and Its Allies in Matthew. SD 28. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1966.

Ehrman, Bart D. Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels. SBLNTGF 1. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1986.

Ehrman, Bart D., Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes. The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen, vol. 1. SBLNTGF 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Geerlings, Jacob. Family E and Its Allies in Luke. SD 35. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.

_____. Family E and Its Allies in Mark. SD 31. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.

_____. Family Π in John. SD 23. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1963.

_____. Family Π in Luke. SD 22. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1962.

_____. Family Π in Matthew. SD 24. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1964.

_____. Family 13 - The Ferrar Group: The Text According to John. SD 21. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1962.

_____. Family 13 - The Ferrar Group: The Text According to Luke. SD 20. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1961.

_____. Family 13 - The Ferrar Group: The Text According to Matthew. SD 19. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1961.

The Gospel According to St. Luke. Part 1: Chapters 1-12; Part 2: Chapters 13-24. IGNTP. Oxford: Clarendon Press, Part 1 - 1984; Part 2 - 1987.

Hansell, Edvardus H. Novum Testamentum Graece: Antiquissimorum Codicum Textus in Ordine Parallelo Dispositi Accedit Collatio Codicis Sinaitici. 3 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1864. (Gregory A, B, C, D, and ℵ)

Harris, J. Rendel. "An Important Manuscript of the New Testament." *JBL* 9 (1890): 31-59. (Gregory 892)

Hoskier, Herman C. A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Codex Evangelium 604. London: David Nutt, 1890. (Gregory 700)

Itala: Das Neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung. Vol 4, ed. Adolf Jülicher. Vols. 1-3, ed. Kurt Aland and Walter Matzkow. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., Vol. 4, 1963; Vols. 1-3, 1970. (Old Latin mss a b e k)

Kenyon, Frederic G. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible, Fasciculus II, The Gospels and Acts. London: Emery Walker, 1933. (Gregory P^{45})

Lake, H., and Kirsopp Lake. Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus. Oxford, 1911-12. (ℵ)

Lake, Kirsopp. Codex 1 of the Gospels and Its Allies. TextsS 3. Cambridge: University Press, 1905.

_____. "Texts from Mount Athos." In Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica: Essays in Biblical and Patristic Criticism, Vol 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1903. (Gregory Ψ and 1071)

Lake, Kirsopp, and Silva Lake. Family 13 (The Ferrar Group): The Text According to Mark. SD 11. London: Christophers, 1941.

Lake, Kirsopp, and Silva New. Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts. HTS 17. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932. (Gregory Ω and 1241)

Lake, Silva. Family Π and the Codex Alexandrinus: The Text According to Mark. SD 5. London: Christophers, 1936.

Legg, S.C.E. Novum Testamentum Graece: Secundum Textum Westcotto-Hortianum. Oxonii: Clarendon, 1940.

Martin, Victor, ed. Papyrus Bodmer II: Evangile de Jean Chap. 1-14. Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1956. (Gregory P^{66})

_____. Papyrus Bodmer II Supplement, Evangile de Jean Chap. 14-21. Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958. (Gregory P^{66})

Martin, Victor, and J.W.B. Barns, eds. Papyrus Bodmer II Supplement (Nouvelle édition augmentée et corrigée): Evangile de Jean Chap. 14-21. Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1962.

Martin, Victor, and Rudolph Kasser, eds. Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Evangile de Luc Chap. 3-24. Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961. (Gregory P^{75})

_____, eds. Papyrus Bodmer XV: Evangile de Jean Chap. 1-15. Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961. (Gregory P^{75})

Mees, M. Die Zitate aus dem Neuen Testament bei Clemens von Alexandrien. Quaderni di Vetera Christianorum 2. Rome: Istituto di Letteratura Cristian Antica, 1970.

Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece. 27th ed. Greek text edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. Critical apparatuses prepared and edited together with the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Münster/Westphalia by Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996. (NA^{27})

Rettig, H.C.M., ed. Antiquissimus Quatuor Evangeliorum Canonicorum Codex Sangellensis Graeco-Latinus Interlinearis. Zurich: Frederich Shulthess, 1836. (Gregory Δ)

Sanders, Henry A. The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer Collection: Part I - The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1912. (Gregory W)

Schmidtke, Alfred. Die Evangelien: Eines alten Unzialcodex nach einer Abschrift des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1903. (Gregory 579)

Scrivener, F.H.A. A Full Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus. 2nd ed. Cambridge, 1867.

_____, ed. Novum Testamentum: Textus Stephanici, A.D. 1550. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Soc., 1887. (TR)

Swanson, Reuben, ed. New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Tischendorf, Constantinus, ed. Monumenta Sacra Inedita. Leipzig: 1846. (Gregory L)

_____. Novum Testamentum Graece: Ad Antiquissimos Testes Denuo Recensuit, vol. 1. 8th ed. Leipzig: Giesecke and Devrient, 1869.

_____, ed. Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum cum epistola Barnabae et fragmentis Pastoris. Leipzig, 1863. (ℵ)

Tregelles, Samuel P, ed. The Greek New Testament: Edited from Ancient Authorities, With Their Various Readings in Full. 2 Vols. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1857-79. (Gregory 33)

von Soden, Hermann. Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer altesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1913.

I B. History and Methodology of New Testament Textual Criticism

Aland, Kurt. "The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research." In The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J. Philip Hyatt, 325-46. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.

_____. Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. 3 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1987.

_____. "The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism." In Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black, ed. Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson, 1-14. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland. The Text of the New Testament. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Bengel, Johann. Novum Testamentum Graecum. 2nd ed. 1763.

Bentley, Richard. Η Καινη Διαθηκη *Graece, Novum Testamentum Versionis Vulgate*, "Proposals for Printing." In The Works of Richard Bentley, ed. Alexander Dyce. London: Francis Macpherson, 1838; reprint, New York: AMS Press, 1966.

Birdsall, J. Neville. "The New Testament Text." In The Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol I, From the Beginnings to Jerome, ed. P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans, 308-77. Cambridge: University Press, 1970.

_____. "The Recent History of New Testament Textual Criticism (from Westcott and Hort, 1881, to the Present)." *ANRW* II.26.1, 99-197. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1992.

Bousett, Wilhelm. "Die Recension des Hesychius." In Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament. TU 11. Leipzig: J.C. Heinrichs, 1894.

Bristol, Lyle O. "New Testament Textual Criticism in the Eighteenth Century." *JBL* 69 (1950): 110-12.

_____. "New Testament Textual Criticism in the Nineteenth Century." *RevExp* 49 (1952): 36-40.

Brooks, James A. The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa. SBLNTGF 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Colwell, Ernest C. "External Evidence and New Testament Criticism." In Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in Honor of Kenneth Willis Clark. SD 29, ed. B.L. Daniels and M.J. Suggs, 1-12. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.

_____. "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Its Limitations." *JBL* 66 (1947): 109-33.
Reprinted in Studies in Methodology, 63-83.

_____. "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program." In Transitions in Biblical Scholarship, ed. J. Coert Rylaarsdam, 131-56. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
Reprinted in Studies in Methodology, 148-71.

_____. "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript." *TU* 73 (1959): 757-77.
Reprinted in Studies in Methodology, 26-44.

_____. "The Origin of Texttypes of New Testament Manuscripts." In Early Christian Origins: Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby, ed. Allen Wikgren, 128-38. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.
Reprinted as "Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts" in Studies in Methodology, 45-55.

_____. "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text." In The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. J. Philip Hyatt, 370-89. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.
Reprinted as "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A study of P^{45}, P^{66}, P^{75} in Studies in Methodology, 106-24.

_____. "The Significance of Grouping New Testament Manuscripts," *NTS* 4 (1958): 73-92.
Reprinted as "Method in Grouping New Testament Manuscripts" in Studies in Methodology, 1-25.

_____. Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament, NTTS 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.

_____. "Variant Readings: Classification and Use." *JBL* 83 (1964): 253-61.
Reprinted as "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings" in Studies in Methodology, 96-105.

Colwell, Ernest C., and Ernest W. Tune. "The Quantitative Relationships between MS Text-Types." In Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey, ed. J.N. Birdsall and R.W. Thomson, 25-32. Freiburg: Herder, 1963.

Reprinted as "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships Between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts" in Studies in Methodology, 56-62.

Comfort, Philip W. The Quest of the Original Text of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.

Daniels, Boyd L., and M. Jack Suggs, eds. Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in Honor of Kenneth Willis Clark. SD 29. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.

Ehrman, Bart. "1 John 4:3 and the Orthodox Corruption of Scripture." *ZNW* 79 (1988): 221-43.

_____. Didymus the Blind and the Text of the Gospels, SBLNTGF 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

_____. "The Gospel Text of Didymus: A Contribution to the Study of the Alexandrian Text." Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1985.

_____. "Heracleon, Origen, and the Text of the Fourth Gospel [Their Use of Variant Textual Traditions]." *VC* 47 (1993): 105-18.

_____. "Methodological Developments in the Analysis and Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence." *NovT* 29 (1987): 22-45.

_____. Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament. Oxford/NewYork: Oxford University Press, 1993.

_____. "A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts." *JBL* (1989-90): 377-88.

_____. "The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity." In The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research, ed. Bart D. Ehman and Michael W. Holmes, 361-79. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

_____. "The Text of Mark in the Hands of the Orthodox." *LQ* 5 (1991): 143-56. Reprinted in Biblical Hermeneutics in Historical Perspective: Studies in Honor of Karlfried Froehlich, ed. Mark Burrows and Paul Rorem, 19-31. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

_____. "Textual Criticism of the New Testament." In Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation, ed. Joel B. Green, 127-45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

_____. "The Theodotians as Corruptors of Scripture." Studia Patristica, 25 (1993): 46-51.

_____. "The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for NT Textual Criticism." In New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods, ed. Barbara Alan and Joel Delobel, 118-35. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 7. Kampen, Netherlands: Pharos, 1994.

_____. "The Use of Group Profiles for the Classification of New Testament Documentary Evidence." *JBL* 106 (1987): 465-86.

Ehrman, Bart D., and Michael W. Holmes, eds. The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the *Status Quaestionis*. SD 46. Grand Repids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Eichhorn, J.G. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Liepzig, 1827.

Elliott, J. Keith. "Introduction" to The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. SD 36, 1-14. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.

_____. "Can We Recover the Original New Testament?" *Theology* 77 (1974): 338-53.

_____. "In Defense of Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism." *ResQ* 21 (1978): 95-115.

_____. "Rational Criticism and the Text of the New Testament." *Theology* 77 (1972): 338-43.

_____, ed. Studies in the New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. NovTSup 44. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

_____. "The Translations of the New Testament into Latin: The Old Latin and the Vulgate." *ANRW* II.26.1, 198-245. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1992.

Epp, Jay Eldon. "The Claremont Profile-Method for Grouping New Testament Minuscule Manuscripts." In Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in Honor of Kenneth Willis Clark, SD 29, ed. Boyd L. Daniels and M. Jack Suggs, 27-38. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967.
Reprinted in J.E. Epp and G.D. Fee, Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism, SD 45, 211-20.

_____. "A Continuing Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism." *HTR* 73 (1980): 131-51.

_____. "The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?" *HTR* 69 (1976): 211-57.

_____. "The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission." In Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission, ed. William L Petersen. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, 3, 1-32. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
Reprinted in J.E. Epp and G.D. Fee, Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism, SD 45, 274-298.

_____. "Textual Criticism." In The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters, ed. E.J. Epp and George W. MacRae, 75-126. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

_____. The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts. SNTSMS 3. Cambridge: University Press, 1966.

_____. "The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism." *JBL* 93 (1974): 386-414.

Epp, Eldon J., and Gordon D. Fee. Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Fee, Gordon D. "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships." *NTS* 15 (1968-69): 23-44.
Reprinted in J.E. Epp and G.D. Fee, Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism, SD 45, 221-43.

_____. "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt," *NTS* 28 (1982): 348-64.

_____. "P^{75}, P^{66}, and Origen: The Myth of Textual Rescension in Alexandria." In New Dimensions in New Testament Studies, ed. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney, 19-45. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.
Reprinted in J.E. Epp and G.D. Fee, Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism, SD 45, 247-73.

_____. "Rigorous of Reasoned Eclecticism - Which?" In Studies in the New Testament Language and Text. Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. ed. J.K. Elliot, 174-97. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

_____. "The Text of John and Mark in the Writings of Chrysostom." *NTS* 26 (1980): 525-47.

_____. "The Text of John in Origen and Cyril of Alexandria: A Contribution to Methodology in the Recovery and Analysis of Patristic Citations." *Bib* 52 (1971): 357-94.
Reprinted in J.E. Epp and G.D. Fee, Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism, SD 45, 301-34.

_____. "The Text of John in *The Jerusalem Bible*: A Critique of the Use of Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism." *JBL* 90 (1971): 163-73.
Reprinted in J.E. Epp and G.D. Fee, Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism, SD 45, 335-43.

_____. "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism: The State of the Question." *ANRW* II.26.1, 246-65. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1992.
Reprinted in J.E. Epp and G.D. Fee, Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism, SD 45, 344-359.

Geerlings, Jacob, and Silva New. "Chrysostom's Text of the Gospel of Mark." *HTR* 24 (1931): 121-42.

Globe, Alexander. "The Gospel Text of Serapion of Thmius." *NovT* 26 (1984): 97-127.

Grant, Robert. "The Citation of Patristic Evidence in an Apparatus Criticus." In New Testament Manuscript Studies, ed. Merrill Parvis and Allen Wikgren. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Greenlee, J. Harold. Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

Griesbach, Johann J. Novum Testamentum Graece, vol. 1. 3rd ed. Emended and expanded by D. David Schulz. Berolini: Friedrich Aue, 1827.

Hug, Johann L. An Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament, vol. 1. Translated by Daniel G. Wait. London: C. & J. Rivington, 1827.

Hurtado, Larry. Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark. SD 43. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.

Hutton, E.A. An Atlas of Textual Criticism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.

Kenyon, F.G. The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts of Papyrus of the Greek Bible. London: Emery Walker, 1933.

_____. A Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. London: MacMillan, 1912.

_____. "Hesychius and the Text of the New Testament." In Memorial Lagrange, ed. Hugues Vincent, 327-34. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1940.

_____. Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible. London: Oxford University Press, 1933; reprint, Munich: Kraus, 1980.

_____. The Text of the Greek Bible. 3rd ed. Revised and augmented by A.W. Adams. London: Duckworth, 1975.

Kilpatrick, G.D. "Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament." In Neutestamentliche Aufsatze. Festschrift fur Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70 Geburtstag, ed. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mussner, 125-37. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963.

_____. "Griesbach and the Development of Textual Criticism." In J.J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies, 1176-1976, ed. B. Orchard and T.R.W. Longstaff. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Lake, Kirsopp, and R.P. Blake. "The Text of the Gospels in the Koredithi Codex." *HTR* 16 (1923): 267-86.

_____. The Text of the New Testament. London: Rivington, 1928.

Martini, Carlo. "Is There a Late Alexandrian Text of the Gospels?" *NTS* 24 (1977-78): 285-96.

_____. Il problema della recensionalita del codice B alla luce del apiro Bodmer XIV. AnBib 26. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966.

McReynolds, Paul R. "The Claremont Profile method and the Grouping of Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1969.

_____. "Establishing Text Families." In The Critical Study of Sacred Texts, ed. Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Religious Studies Series, 1979.

Metzger, Bruce M. "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels." In Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism. NTTS 4. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

_____. Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism. NTTS 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963.

_____. "Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts." In Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey, ed. J. Neville Birdsall and R.W. Thomson, 78-95. Freiburg: 1963.

_____. Manuscripts of the Greek Bible. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

_____. "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament." *NTS* 18 (1971-72): 387-95.

_____. "Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament: A Brief Survey of Research, 1937-1967." In Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian. NTTS 8. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

_____. The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration. 3rd ed. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

_____. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1975.

Milne, H.J.M., and T.C. Skeat. Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus. London: British Museum, 1938.

Murphy, Harold. "Eusebius' New Testament Text in the *Demonstratio Evangelica*." *JBL* 78 (1954): 162-68.

O'Neill, J.C. "The Study of the New Testament." In Nineteenth Century Religious Thought in the West, ed. Vivian Smart, et. al., 143-78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Osburn, Carroll D. "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Hippolytus of Rome." *SecCent* 2 (1982): 97-124.

Pervo, Richard I. "Social and Religious Aspects of the Western Text." In The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders, ed. Dennis E. Groh and Robert Jewett, 229-41. New York: University Press of America, 1985.

Petersen, William L. "The Text of the Gospels in Origen's Commentaries on John and Matthew." In Origen of Alexandria: His Wrold and Legacy, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen, 34-47. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988.

Porter, Calvin. "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P^{75}) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus." *JBL* 81 (1962): 363-76.

Rice, George. "Western Non-Interpolations: A Defense of the Apostolate." In Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar, ed. Charles Talbert, 1-16. New York: Crossroad, 1984.

Richards, W.L. The Classification of the Greek Manuscripts of the Johannine Epistles. SBLDS 35. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

_____. "A Critique of a New Testament Text-Critical Methodology - The Claremont Profile Method." *JBL* 96 (1977): 555-66.

_____. "An Examination of the Claremont Profile Method in the Gospel of Luke: A Study in Text-Critical Methodology." *NTS* 27 (1980): 52-63.

_____. "Manuscript Grouping in Luke 10 by Quantitative Analysis." *JBL* 98 (1979): 379-91.

_____. "Test Passages or Profiles: A Comparison of Two Text-Critical Methods." *JBL* 115 (1996): 251-69.

Scrivener, F.H.A. A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, vol. 2. 4th ed. London: George Bell & Sons, 1894.

Semler, Johann S. Apparatus ad liberalem Novi Testamenti interpretationem. Halle: n.p., 1767.

_____. Hermeneutische Vorbeitung, vol. 3. Halle: n.p.

Streeter, B.H. The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins. New York: Macmillan, 1924.

Suggs, M. Jack. "The Use of Patristic Evidence in the Search for a Primitive New Testament Text." *NTS* 4 (1958): 139-47.

Vincent, Marvin. A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. New York: MacMillan, 1903.

Westcott, B.F., and F.J.A. Hort. Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882; reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988.

White, R.J. Dr. Bentley: A Study in Academic Scarlet. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1965.

Wisse, Frederik. "The Claremont Profile Method for the Classification of the Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts: A Study in Method." Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968.

_____. The Profile Method for Classifying and Evaluating Manuscript Evidence. SD 44. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Zuntz, Günther. The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the *Corpus Paulinum*. Schweich Lectures, 1946. London: British Academy, 1953.

II. THE WRITINGS OF ATHANASIUS

II A. Critical Editions - Greek

Halkin, Francisci, ed. *Sancti Pachomii Vitae Graece*. Subsidia Hagiographica 19. Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1932.

Joannou, Périclès-Pierre. Fonti, Fascicolo IX, Discipline Generale Antique (IVe- IXe s.), t. II, Les canons des Peres Grecs. Roma: Grottaferrata, 1963.

Kannengiesser, Charles, ed. and trans. Sur l'incarnation du Verbe: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes. SC 199. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1973.

Leone, Luigi, ed. and trans. Sancti Athanasii, Archiepiscopi Alexandriae: Contra Gentes - Introduzione, Testo Critico, Traduzione. Collana di Studi Greco 43. Napoli: Libreria Scientifica Editrice, 1965.

Ludwig, Georgius, ed. Epistula ad Epictetum. Jenae: Typis H. Pohle, 1911.

Migne, J.-P., ed. Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca Prior, vols. 25-28. paris, 1863.

Opitz, H.-G. Athanasius Werke 2. Berlin and Leipzig: 1935-41.

Szymusiak Jan M., ed. and trans. Athanase d'Alexandrie: Deux Apologies, Apologie a l'empereur Constance et Apologie pour sa Fuite - Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes. SC 56. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1958.

Thomson, Robert, W., ed. and trans. Athanasius: Contra Gentes and De Incarnatione. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Windstedt, E.O., ed. The Christian Topography of *Cosmas Indicopleustes*. Cambridge: Cambrisge University Press, 1909.

Wolska-Conus, Wanda. *Cosmas Indicopleustes*: Topographie chretienne 3. SC 197. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1973.

II B. Critical Editions - Versions

Draguet, R. La Vie primitive de S. Antoine conservee en syriaque. CSCO 417 (= Scriptores Syri 183; 1980) (text); CSCO 418 (= Scriptores Syri 184; 1980)

Egan, George, ed. and trans. The Armenian Version of the Letters of Athanasius to Bishop of Serapion Concerning the Holy Spirit. SD 37. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.

Lefort, L-Th., ed. S. Athanase, Lettres Festales et Pastorales en Copte. CSCO 150. Scriptores Coptici, Tomus 19. Louvain: CSCO, 1955.

Riedel, William, and W.E. Crum, eds. The Canons of Athanasius of Alexandria: The Arabic and Coptic Versions. London: Williams and Norgate, 1904.

Thomson, Robert W., ed. Athanasia Syriaca: Part I, 1. De Incarnatione, 2. Epistula ad Epictetum. CSCO 257. Scriptores Syri, Tomus 114. Louvain: CSCO, 1965.

_____, trans. Athanasia Syriaca: Part I, 1. De Incarnatione, 2. Epistula ad Epictetum. CSCO 258. Scriptores Syri, Tomus 115. Louvain: CSCO, 1965.

II C. Translations

Atkinson, Miles, trans. Historical Tracts of St. Athanasius. Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1843.

Bright, William, trans. Historical Writings of St. Athanasius according to the Benedictine Text. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1881.

_____, trans. The Orations of St. Athanasius against the Arians according to the Benedictine Text, with an Account of His Life. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1873.

Burgess, Henry, trans. The Festal Letters of St. Athanasius. Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1844.

Camelot, Pierre Thomas, ed. and trans. Contre les Paiens: Texte Grec, Introduction, traduction et notes. SC 18. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1977.

Casey, Robert Pierce. The De Incarnatione of Athanasius: Part 2 - The Short Recension. SD 14. Philadelphia: Univeristy of Pennsylvania Press, 1946.

Cross, Frank Leslie. Athanasius - De Incarnatione: An Edition of the Greek Text. Texts for Students 50. London: S.P.C.K., 1963.

Gregg, Robert C., trans. Athanasius: The Life of Antony and The Letter to Marcellinus. New York: Paulist Press, 1980.

W.C.L., trans. The Orations of St. Athanasius Against the Arians. The Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature. London: Griffith Farran & Co., (18--).

Lebon, Joseph, trans. Lettres a Serapion sur la Divinite du Saint-Esprit: Introduction et traduction. SC 15. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1947.

Meijering, E.P. Athanasius - Contra Gentes: Introduction, Translation and Commentary. Philosophia Patrum 7. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1984.

_____. Athanasius: De Incarnation Verbi. Amsterdam, 1989.

Newman, John Henry, Cardinal, trans. Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians. 2nd ed. London: Pickering, 1881.

Robertson, Archibald, ed. Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria. NPNF, Second Series, 4. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1892; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

_____, ed. St. Athanasius on the Incarnation, The Greek Text Edited for the Use of Students, Based on the Codex Seguerianus. London: 1893.

Ryan, George J. The De Incarnatione of Athanasius: Part 1 - The Long Recension Manuscripts. SD 14. Philadelphia: Univeristy of Pennsylvania Press, 1945.

Shapland, C.R.B., trans. The Letters of St. Athanasius Concerning the Holy Spirit. London: Epworth Press, 1951.

Sparks, Jack N., trans. The Resurrection Letters, St. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria from A.D. 328-373. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1979.

III. GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY: ATHANASIUS' LIFE AND THEOLOGY, PATRISTICS AND EARLY CHURCH HISTORY, AND LITERARY THEORY

Altaner, B. Patrology. 5th ed. Translated by H. Graef. Freiburg: Herder, 1958.

Arnold, Duane W.-H. "Athanasius and the Meletians at the Synod of Tyre, AD 335." *Coptic Church Review* 10 (1989): 67-73.

_____. The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991.

Badger, Carlton Mills. The New Man Created in God: Christology, Congregation, and Asceticism in Athanasius of Alexandria. Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1990.

Barnard, L.W. "Athanasius and the Emperor Jovian." In Studia Patristica 21, 384-389. Berlin: Verlag.

_____. "Athanasius and the Meletian Schism in Egypt." *JEA* 59 (1975): 183-89.

_____. "Some Notes on the Meletian Schism." In Studia Patristica 12 (= TU 115), 399-405. Berlin: Verlag, 1975.

Barnes, Michel R., and Daniel H. Williams, eds. Araianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflicts. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.

Barnes, Timothy. "Angel of Light or Mystic Initiate? The Problem of the *Life of Anthony*." *JTS* 37 (1986): 351-68.

_____. Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

_____. "The Career of Athanasius." In Studia Patristica 21, 390-401. Berlin: Verlag.

_____. Constantine and Eusebius. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Barthélemy, D. "Origène et le texte de l'Ancien Testament." In Etudes d'histoire du text de l'Ancien Testament, Orbicus biblicus et orientalis 21, 203-17. Freiburg: Éditions Universitaires, 1978.

Bell, Harold Idris. Jews and Christians in Egypt: The Jewish Troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian Controversy. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1924.

Berg, Temma A. "Psychologies of Reading." In Tracing Literary Theory, ed. Joseph Natoli, 248-77. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1987.

Bienert, W.A. "Zur Logos-Christologie des Athanasius von Alexandrien in *contra Gentes* und *de Incarnatione*." In Studia Patristica 21, 402-19. Berlin: Verlag, 1989.

Bonner, Stanley F. Education in Ancient Rome. London: Methuen, 1977.

Brakke, David. Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Breckenridge, James. "Julian and Athanasius." *Theology* 76 (1973): 73-81.

Brennan, Brian. "Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*: A Sociological Interpretation." *VC* 39 (1985): 209-27.

_____. "Dating Athanasius' *Vita Antonii*." *VC* 30 (1976): 52-54.

Brock, S.P. "Origen's Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament." Studia Patristica 10:1, 215-18. Berlin: Acadamie-Verlag, 1970.

Cayre, F. Manual of Patrology and History of Theology, Vol I. Translated by H. Howitt. Paris: Desclée, 1935.

Clavis Patrum Graecorum, vol. 2. Ed. Mauritii Geerard. Brepols: Turnhout, 1974.

Clayton, Allen Lee. "The Orthodox Recovery of a Heretical Proof-Text: Athanasius of Alexandria's Interpretation of Proverbs 8:22-30 in Conflict with the Arians." Ph.D. diss., Southern Methodist University, 1988.

Cross, Frank Leslie. The Study of St. Athanasius: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered before the University of Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1945.

Daniélou, Jean. Origen. Translated by Walter Mitchell. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1955.

Dawson, David. Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Dorival, G. "Athanase on Pseudo-Athanase." *RSLR* 16 (1980): 80-89.

Dragas, George Dion. Athanasiana: Essays in the Theology of Saint Athanasius. London, 1980.

_____. St. Athanasius: Contra Apollonarem. Athens: Church and Theology, 1985.

Duling, Dennis. Jesus Christ through History. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1979.

Ernest, James D. "Athanasius of Alexandria: The Scope of Scripture in Polemical and Pastoral Context." *VC* 47 (1993): 341-62.

Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History.* Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History. The Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 1 translated by Kirsopp Lake. Vol. 2 translated by J.E.L. Oulton. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, Vol. I 1926, Vol. II 1932.

Ferguson, Everett. "Athanasius' *Epistola ad marcellinum in interpretationem Psalmorum.*" In Studia Patristica 16:2, 295-308. Berlin: Verlag, 1985.

_____, ed. Orthodoxy, Heresy, and Schism in Early Christianity. Studies in Early Christianity 4. New York: Garland, 1993.

Fish, Stanley. Is There a Text in the Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Forbes, Frances Alice Monica. St. Athanasius. London: R. & T. Washbourne, 1919.

Frend, W.H.C. The Early Church. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

_____. A New Eusebius: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church to AD 337. London: SPCK, 1987.

_____. The Rise of Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

_____. Saints and Sinners in the Early Church: Differing and Conflicting Traditions in the First Six Centuries. Theology and Life 11. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1985.

Gamble, Harry Y. Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Goldstein, Philip. The Politics of Literary Theory: An Introduction to Marxist Criticism. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1990.

Grant, Robert M. Heresy and Criticism: The Search for Authenticity in Early Christian Literature. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.

_____. "Theological Education at Alexandria." In The Roots of Egyptian Christianity, ed. Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring, 178-89. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Green, Henry A. "The Socio-Economic Background of Christianity in Egypt." In The Roots of Egyptian Christianity, ed. Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring, 100-113. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Gregg, Robert C., ed. Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments. Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, September 5-10, 1983, Oxford, England. Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985.

Gregg, Robert C., and E. Groh. Early Arianism: A View of Salvation. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.

Griggs, C. Wilfred. Early Egyptian Christianity: From Its Origins to 451 C.E. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990.

Hanson, R.P.C. The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-391. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

Hardy, Edward R. Christology of the Later Fathers. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.

Harris, Wendell V. Literary Meaning: Reclaiming the Study of Literature. New York: New York University Press, 1996.

Hollerich, M.J. "The Alexandrian Bishops and the Grain Trade: Ecclesiastical Commerce in Late Roman Egypt." *Journal of the Economic and social History of the Orient* 25 (1982): 187-207.

Judge, E.A., and S.R. Pickering. "Papyrus Documentation of Church and Community in Egypt to the Mid-4th Century." JAC 20 (1977): 47-71.

Kannengiesser, Charles. "Alexander and Arius of Alexandria: The Last Ante-Nicene Theologians." In Miscelanea En Homenaje Al P. Antonio Orbe Compostellanum, 35:1/2, 391-403. Santiago de Compostela, 1990.
Reprinted in Arius and Athanasius, Chapter IV.

_____. Arius and Athanasius: Two Alexandrian Theologians. Hampshire, Great Britain: Variorum, 1991.

_____. "Arius and the Arians." *TS* 44 (1983): 456-75.
Reprinted in Arius and Athanasius, Chapter II.

_____. Athanase d'Alexandrie Eveque et Ecrivain: Une Lecture des Traites Contre les Ariens. Paris: Beauchesne, 1983.

_____. "The Athanasian Decade (1974-1984): A Bibliographic Report." *TS* 46 (1985): 524-541.
Reprinted in Arius and Athanasius, Chapter XI.

_____. "Athanasius and the Foundation of Traditional Christology." *TS* 34 (1973).

_____. "Athanasius of Alexandria, *Three Orations Against the Arians*: A Reappraisal." In Studia Patristica, 17:3, 981-95. Oxford, 1982.
Reprinted in Arius and Athanasius, Chapter IX.

_____. "Athanasius of Alexandria vs. Arius: The Alexandrian Crisis." In The Roots of Egyptian Christianity, ed. Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring, 204-15. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
Reprinted in Arius and Athanasius, Chapter XII.

_____. "The *Blasphemies* of Arius: Athanasius of Alexandria, *De Synodis* 15." In Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments. Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, September 5-10, 1983. Patristic Monograph Series, 11, ed. Robert C. Gregg, 59-78. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1985. 59-78. Reprinted in Arius and Athanasius, Chapter III.

_____. "La Date de l'Apologie d'Athanase *Contre les paiens* et *Sur l'Incarnation du Verbe*." *RSR* 58 (1970): 383-428. Reprinted in Arius and Athanasius, Chapter VI.

_____. Early Christian Spirituality. Translated by Pamela Bright. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

_____. Holy Scripture and Hellenistic Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology: The Arian Crisis. Berkeley, CA: Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 1982. Reprinted in Arius and Athanasius, Chapter I.

_____. "Le témoignage des *lettres festales* de Saint Athanase sur la date de l'Apologie *Contre les paiens - Sur l'Incarnation du Verbe*." *RSR* 52 (1964): 91-100. Reprinted in Arius and Athanasius, Chapter V.

_____. "Three Orations Against the Arians: A Reappraisal." In Studia Patristica, 17:3, 981-95. Berlin: Verlag.

Kemp, E.W. "Bishops and Presbyters at Alexandria." *JEH* 6 (1955): 125-42.

Kenyon, Frederic G. Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Kopacek, Thomas. A History of Neo-Arianism. Patristic Monograph Series 8. Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979.

von Lemm, O. "Koptische Fragmente zur Patriarchen-geschichte Alexandriens." In Memoires de l'Academie Imperiale des Sciences de St. Petersbourg 36, No. 11 (1888).

Louth, Andrew. "St. Athanasius and the Greek *Life of Anthony*." *JTS* 39 (1988): 504-9.

Ludemann, Gerd. Heretics: The Other Side of Early Christianity. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1996.

Lyman, J. Rebecca. Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Malherbe, Abraham. Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook. Library of Early Christianity 4. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.

Marrou, H.I. A History of Education in Antiquity. Translated by George Lamb. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.

Martin, A. "Athanase et les Méletiens" In Politique et Théologie, ed. C. Kannengiesser, 31-61. Paris, 1974.

Meeks, Wayne. The Moral World of the First Christians. Library of Early Christianity 6. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.

Meijering, E.P. Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius: Syntehsis or Antithesis. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974.

Methodius of Aksum. "When Was the *ad Epictetum* Written?" In Pluralisme et Oecumenisme en Recherches Theologiques. Melanges offerts au R.P. Dockx, O.P., 23-26. Louvain: Duculot, 1976.

Metzler, Karin. Ariana et Athanasiana: Studien zur Uberlieferung and zu Philologischen Problemen der Werke des Athanasius von Alexandrien. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1991.

Mohler, Johann Adam. Athanasius der Grosse. 1844; reprint, Frankfurt: Minerva, 1973.

Moore, Stephen D. Literary Criticism and the Gospels: Theoretical Challenge. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.

Moutsoulas, E. "Le problèmede la date des 'Trois Discours' contre les Ariens d'Athanase d'Alexandrie." In Studia Patristica, 16:2, 324-41. Berlin: Verlag, 1985.

Nautin, P. Origene: Sa vie et son oeuvre. Christianisme Antique 1. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977.

Nordberg, Henric. Athanasius and the Emperor. Societas Scientarium Fennica: Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 30.3. Helsinki: Helsingfors, 1963.

_____. Athanasius' Tractates Contra Gentes-De Incarnatione: An Attempt at Redating. Societas Scientarium Fennica: Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 28.3. Helsinki: Helsingfors, 1961.

_____. "On the Bible Text of St. Athanasius." In Arctos: Acta Philologica Fennica. Nova Series, 3, 119-41. Helsink: Helsingfors, 1962.

_____. "A Reconsideration of the Date of St. Athanasius' *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*." In Studia Patristica 3 (= TU 78). Berlin: Verlag, 1961.

Norman, Keith. Deification: The Content of Athanasian Soteriology. Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1980.

Norris, Richard, Jr., ed. and trans. The Christological Controversy. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Opitz, Hans-Georg. Untersuchungen zur Uberlieferung der Schriften des Athanasius. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 23. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1935.

_____, ed. Urkunden zur Geschichte des arianischen Streites, vol. 3.

Pearson, Birger A. "Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some Observations." In The Roots of Egyptian Christianity. ed. Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring, 132-59. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Pearson, Birger A., and James E Goehring, eds. The Roots of Egyptian Christianity. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine. 1. The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

_____. The Light of the World: A Basic Image in Early Christian Thought. New York: Harper, 1962.

Pettersen, Alvyn. "The Arian Context of Athanasius of Alexandria's *Tomus ad Antiochenos* VII." *JEH* 41 (1990): 183-98.

_____. Athanasius. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse, 1995.

_____. "Athanasius' Presentation of Antony of the Desert's Admiration for his Body." In Studia Patristica, 21, 438-47. Berlin: Verlag.

_____. "A Reconsideration of the Date of *contra Gentes - De Incarnatione* of Athanasius of Alexandria." In Studia Patristica, 17:3, 1030-1040. Berlin: Verlag.

Pfeiffer, Rudolf. History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

Philostorgius. *Ecclesiastical History* (as epitomized by Photius). In Sozomen's Ecclesiastical History. Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library. Translated by E. Walford. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854.

Pinborg, Jan. "Classical Antiquity: Greece." In Current Trends in Linguistics, vol. 13, Historiography of Linguistics, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, 102-26. Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1975.

Quasten, Johannes. Patrology, Vol III: The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1966.

Rabinowitz, Peter J. "Whirl Without End: Audience-Oriented Criticism." In Contemporary Literary Theory, ed. G. douglas Atkins and Laura Morrow. Amherst: University of Massachussetts Press, 1989.

Roberts, Colin. Manuscripts, Society, and Belief in Early Christian Egypt. London: Oxford University Presss, 1979.

Robinson, Thomas A. The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of heresy in the Early Christian Church. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 11. Lewiston, NY: E. Mellen Press, 1988.

Rolandus, Johannes. Le Christ et l'homme dans la Theologie d'Athanase d' Alexandrie. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.

Rufinus. *Opera*. CChr, Series Latina 20, ed. Manlius Simonetti. Brepols: Turnholt, 1961.

Schneemelcher, W. "Die Kirchweihsynode von Antiochien 341." In Bonner Festgabe Johannes Straub zum 65. Geburstag am 18. October 1977 dargebracht von Kollegen und Schulern. Bonn: 1977, 319-346.

Scott-Moncrief, Philip David. Paganism and Christianity in Egypt. Cambridge: University Press, 1913.

Slusser, Michael. "Athanasius, *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*: Place and Date of Composition." *JTS* 37 (1986): 114-17.

Socrates. *Ecclesiastical History*. Socrate's Ecclesiastical History. Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854.

_____. *Ecclesiastical History*. In NPNF, 2nd Series, 2, ed. A.C. Zenos, 1-178. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952.

Sozomen. *Ecclesiastical History*. Sozomen's Ecclesiastical History. Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library. Translated by E. Walford. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854.

_____. *Ecclesiastical History*. In NPNF, 2nd Series, 2, ed. Chester D. Hartranft, 179-427. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952.

Stead, G. Christopher. "Athanasius' Earliest Written Work." *JTS* 39 (1988): 76-91.

_____. "Rhetorical Method in Athanasius." *VC* 30 (1976): 121-37.

_____. "St. Athanasius on the Psalms." *VC* 39 (1985): 65-78.

Stowers, Stanley. Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity. Library of Early Christianity 5. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.

Stülcken, A. Athanasiana: Litterar- und dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen. TU 19.4. 1899.

Telfer, W.R. "Meletius of Lycopolis and Episcopal Succession in Egypt," *HTR* 48 (1955): 227-37.

Tetz, M. "Athanasius von Alexandrian," 333.

Theodoretus. *Ecclesiastical History*. In History of the Church by Theodoret and Evagrius. Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854.

_____. *Ecclesiastical History*. In NPNF, Second Series, 3, ed. Blomfield Jackson, 33-159. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.

Tilley, Maureen A. The Use of Scripture in Christian North Africa: An Examination of Donatist Hermeneutics. Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1989.

Tixeront. J. A Handbook of Patrology, 4th ed. Translated by S.A. Raemers. St. Louis: Herder, 1920.

Trigg, Joseph W. Biblical Interpretation. Message of the Fathers of the Church 9. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988.

_____. Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third-Century Church. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983.

Twomey, Vincent. Apostolikos Thronos: The Primacy of Rome as Reflected in the Church History of Eusebius and the Historico-Apologetic Writings of Saint Athanasius the Great. Munster: Aschendorff, 1982.

Ulrich, Eugene. "Origen's Old Testament Text: The Transmission History of the Septuagint to the Third Century, C.E." In Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen, 3-33. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988.

Van Der Valk, M. Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad, Part 2. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964.

Van Winden, J.C.M. "On the Date of Athanasius' Apologetical Treatises." *VC* 29 (1975): 291-95.

Vivian, Tim. St. Peter of Alexandria: Bishop and Martyr. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

de Vogel, C.J. Athanasius, Aartsbisschop van Alexandrie (328-373): Redevvoeringen tegen de Arianen. Utrecht and Brussel: Het Spedtrum, 1949.

Widdicombe, Peter. The Fatherhood of God from Origen to Athanasius. Osford/New York: Calrendon Press, 1994.

Williams, Rowan. "Arius and the Meletian Schism." *JTS* 37 (1986): 35-

_____. Arius: Heresy and Tradition. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1987.

Wright, John. "Origen in the Scholar's Den: A Rationale for the Hexapla." In Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen, 48-62. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988.

Young, Frances M. From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Zervopoulos, Gerassismos. "The Gospels-Text of Athanasius." Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1955.

BIOGRAPHY

I am John Jay Brogan and this is my "biography" - the quirky thing appended to a dissertation that provides the "vital information" about my life (read, "academic pedigree"). I was born to Robert and Doris Brogan on July 2, 1959 in Hastings, Michigan. I began my education in the same one-room, country school that both my father and grandfather attended (my own piece of Americana).

I graduated summa cum laude with a B.S. in Mathematics at the University of Dayton (1981). I was awarded a Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship (1982-84) from the U.S. Department of Education to attend the University of Michigan where I received an M.A. (April 1984) in Modern Near Eastern and North African Studies. After marrying Kathryn A. Gray (May 12, 1984), we attended Bethel Theological Seminary (St. Paul, MN) where I completed an MDiv and Kathy an MATS (May 1988), both concentrating in Old Testament Studies. I received a Duke University Graduate Research Assistantship (1988-92) and completed my doctoral exams (April 1991) with distinction in NT and Christian Origins, Hebrew Bible, and Islamic History.

I have published reviews in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* and *Religious Studies Review* and have presented papers at SBL Annual and Regional Meetings (1991,92,93).

I was appointed a Junior Teaching Fellow (1990-91) by the American Association of Colleges at Duke. I taught full-time at Calvin College (Grand Rapids, MI; 1995-97) and Palm Beach Atlantic College (West Palm Beach, FL; 1993-95). I also taught as an adjunct at Meredith College (Raleigh, NC) and Reformed Theological Seminary (Charlotte, NC) while at Duke. I will be teaching at Northwestern College (Orange City, IA) beginning the fall of 1997.

We have two children, Erin (4/7/88) and Joel (6/17/92).

248 RD TH 2016
05/21/97 33357 SELF
INFORMATION CONSERVATION INC